EXÓDUS:

An Autobiography of Moses

J. M. DENNISTON, M.A

FEB 27 '02

BS 1245 .D466 1894
Denniston, J. M.
Exodus: an autobiography of Moses.

THE KING'S INSTITUTE
THE CHURCH ON THE WAY

EXODUS:

AN AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF MOSES.

EXODUS:

AN AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF MOSES.

With the Four following Books.

BY

J. M. DENNISTON, M.A.

LONDON:
MORGAN AND SCOTT,
12, PATERNOSTER BUILDINGS, E.C.
1894.

1245
.D466
1894

PREFACE.

UNTIL very lately it was the belief of Christians, as of Jews, that the words in the Pentateuch, "Jehovah spake unto Moses," and "These are the statutes and the judgments which Jehovah your God commanded you," were to be taken in their natural sense, as the declaration by Moses of a genuine fact each time they were uttered. But a new "Criticism" has sprung up to tell us that, instead of any writing of Moses, we have only a set of compilations many centuries later—say from 800–600 B.C.—which, being afterwards combined by an editor, were published by Ezra and Nehemiah; while Deuteronomy is a composition by itself, brought forward under the reign of Josiah as the lost book of the law. Thus the story of what Jehovah really spake to Moses is lost to us. And what we have got in its stead we cannot tell. Now the proof of this very serious conclusion is grounded chiefly on the alleged incongruities in the story, dislocations in the narrative, and peculiarities in the style, which oblige us to break up the history, and seek its fragments in writers later by centuries, and differing, as such always do. The present object is to

examine strictly the internal evidence with reference to the variations alleged. Exodus is first minutely entered into, and then various of the impugned passages in Leviticus, Numbers, and Joshua; the theory as regards Deuteronomy and its relation to the other books being taken up at some length.

To enter upon all the numberless objections of the critics would be impossible. But three lists of words (from Dr. Driver), as peculiar to certain sources, with about 120 separate heads, and including above 2000 texts, have been examined in detail. And if it be shown that in no case can the objections made be sustained, then something has been effected. The work is now earnestly commended to Him whose truth it seeks to "contend for."

CONTENTS.

	PAGES
Jehovah-Elohim Theory	1–26
Exodus	27–156
Call of Moses till the Leaving of Egypt	27–79
From that till the Law-giving	80–117
Tabernacle Ordered	117–130
Golden Calf and Sequel	130–148
Erection of Tabernacle	148–153
Conclusion to Exodus	153–156
Leviticus—Alleged Discrepancies	157–163
Law of Holiness	163–168
Numbers—Alleged Double Narrative	169, 170
The Great Conspiracy	170–173
Case of Balaam	173–177
Deuteronomy—Finding of the Book	178–180
What this Book says of Itself	180–187
The Man for the supposed Work	187–190
The Material and Composition	191–195
"Peculiar Expressions"	195–202
Alleged Discordances	203–212
Joshua	213–235
Passage of Jordan	217–220
Taking of Jericho	221–223
Taking of Hebron	224–227
The Suspected Altar	227–230
Closing Addresses of Joshua	230–234
Special Objections	234, 235
Appendix on "Peculiarities" of P	237–268

THE JEHOVAH-ELOHIM THEORY:

IS IT A PRACTICAL POSSIBILITY?

THE answer to this question is of extreme importance. For it is by this theory, above all, that the Pentateuch is broken up into a bewildering array of fragments, with all the serious consequences of the same. It is now sought to lay bare the basis of the structure; or, in other words, to dig closely all round, so as to discover whether this wide-spreading tree, with its seductive fruit, has really any root at all. And the conclusion is, that of real foundation or root there is none here. This examination was needful before enquiring into the unity of Exodus, and its consequent fitness to be an autobiography of Moses. For so long as the narrative is parted out among a variety of unknown sources, there is no possibility of unity, no room for the thought of autobiography. We begin by stating the Theory in the words of its best-known promoters.

"Certain phenomena show incontrovertibly" (says Canon Driver)* "that Genesis is composed of distinct documents, or sources, which have been welded by a late compiler into a continuous whole." (p. 6.) "The Hebrew historiographer is essentially a compiler or arranger of pre-existing documents, not an original author. But so strongly marked are the individualities of style, that the documents or sources so combined can generally be distinguished without difficulty from each other and the comments of the compiler." (p. 3.) These

* Introduction to the *Literature of the Old Testament.*

phenomena present, we are told, two distinct styles. Thus that of chapter i. to ii. 4 (the Elohist) is "unornate, measured, precise, with particular phrases frequently occurring (as in *vv.* 5, 8, 13, 19, 23, 31, also 7, 9, 11, 15, 24, 30, and 10, 12, 18, 21, 25, 31.) The style, on the other hand, of chapter ii. 4, to end of iii. (Jehovist) is freer and more varied. The actions of God are described with some fulness and picturesqueness of detail. Instead of simply *speaking* and *creating*, as in chapter i., He *fashions*, *breathes*, *plants*, *places*, *takes*, *sets*, *closes* up, *builds*, and even *walks*."

So in the *Deluge* narrative there is said to be a corresponding difference between the parallel accounts; and the same comes out in the histories of Abraham and Isaac, the promise to Sarah, the accounts of Rebekah, and Jacob's wives, the names Bethel and Israel, the movements of Esau, and the history of Joseph, which consists of long passages from the two sources. (p. 16.) Thus "Genesis presents a group of sections distinguished by difference of phraseology and style. Nor are these isolated and indiscriminate. They are numerous, and reappear with singular persistency in connection with each other." "Each of the two documents (says Delitsch) is marked by a series of recurring features absent from the other, and by which it is connected with other sections of the book; the interchange of the Divine names being especially noticeable." This of course it is which has given their designation to the two historical sources insisted on. Thus the critics are content to take by itself the one fact of the difference in the divine names, and to combine that with what seems to them another fact; namely, that with the names respectively there goes a marked and persistent diversity of style. But one thing they regularly avoid; and that is, a thorough inquiry into the *relation* of these facts, and whether there be not something in the different *ideas*, as expressed by the names, to account for the difference of style associated with them.

In regard then to the two lines of style, let us observe

that the leader of one, the *Elohist*, as he used to be called, is now better known as P—from *Priests' Code*—because it is found that the author of all that properly comes under that title in the Pentateuch (such as the Tabernacle and Levitical services) is marked by the same peculiarities of style as the author of Genesis i., and the other Elohim portions of Genesis. From Exodus vi., however, and onward, this Elohist takes up the name 'Jehovah'; but, from the peculiarities of his style can still be recognized as the original P. It is these then —the *Jehovist* of Genesis ii. iii. &c., and the Elohistic P of chapter i.—that employ the two styles, which are said to be so strongly marked.

But besides this Elohistic P, there is still an E, or minor Elohist, who also has his points of distinction from J, but much less strongly marked; the styles of the two vary, but by no means as J and P do. And indeed the two are so treated that, while frequently credited with distinct portions as J and E, they are also very frequently bracketed together as J E, both having a share, or probably so, in the passage, but beyond the power of certain discrimination. Thus Dr. Driver says, "I do not desire to lay equal stress on all the particulars of the analysis, or to be supposed to hold the line of demarcation between its component parts, at every point, as clear and certain as it is betwixt P and other parts of the Hexateuch."

As to P, "his aim, we are told, is to give a systematic view, from a priestly standpoint, of the origin and chief institutions of the Israelitish theocracy." All that he writes is coloured by this view. "In the arrangements of his materials system and circumstantiality are the guiding principles, and their influence may be traced both in the plan of his narrative as a whole, and in his treatment of individual sections." (p. 118 *et seq.*)

Going to another of the Critics, we find Wellhausen saying,* "The Priestly Code shows a marked predilection for

* *Encyc. Britan.* "Pentateuch."

numbers and measures, arrangements (as in titles to sections) and formality of scheme. It is known also by poverty and inflexibility of language, by standing repetitions of inflexions and phrases, not elsewhere found in Old Hebrew. And *thus it can always be recognised without difficulty.*"

Another of the critics (Kuenen) writes: "the Elohist is simple, clear, circumstantial, frigid, no orator, fond of repetition, technicality, minute chronology, ancient genealogies, statistical summaries and traditions, with much fulness of expression (as in Creation and Flood) and much that is lawyer-like in his language. The 'Jehovist,' on the other hand, is pointed and terse, smooth but spirited, fond of derivations, rhetorical, brilliant, with much colour, skill in narrative (as in Genesis ii. iv. xi.), much given to anthropomorphic views of Deity, anxious to point out the divine implication of events, as one who has stronger convictions than the 'Elohist' on the nature and history of man."

Returning to Dr. Driver. "It is impossible to doubt," says he (p. 14), "that the main conclusions of critics with reference to the authority of the Books of the Old Testament rest upon reasonings, the cogency of which cannot be denied without denying the ordinary principles on which history is judged, and evidence estimated. . . . The conclusions in the present instance are only opposed by some theologians because they are supposed to conflict with the requirements of the Christian faith." Then follows a statement deprecating the notion that the critical view leads to anything essentially different from the traditional. "It is only the *form*, not the *fact*, of revelation that is affected." The new view helps us to understand "the stages, the phases, and the process. It does not touch either the authority or the inspiration of the Old Testament." *

* Other notices are these: "As to J, he paints a scene which, before he has finished, is indelibly impressed on the reader's memory. In ease and grace his narratives are unsurpassed. The amount of detail is

All this now brings us to two questions of essential moment. The first regards *the Theory itself*, the second the *practical working of it out.*

Now, the Theory is that, apart from any special meaning in the names, which is no part of its concern, there have sprung up in connection with them two or more different styles, each distinguished by characteristic marks, such as above described. As to the Names, with their meaning, here is the most that the Theory can allow. "It is true (says Dr. Driver) that 'Elohim' and 'Jehovah' represent the Divine Nature, under different aspects, viz., as the God of Nature and the God of Revelation respectively; but it is only in a small number of instances that this distinction can be applied, without great artificiality, to explain the varieties between the two names in the Pentateuch." (p. 11.) That is to say, they are of no practical value, and are made no actual use of, for determining any of the questions at issue. Strange that a critic, after allowing as much, should stop here! If the *names* differ in *meaning*, even to this extent (although the view is extremely inadequate), it was only natural to suppose that, *so far*, they might control their context. But if this be allowed, then a great principle is conceded. And if such an operation should appear, even on the very superficial view here expressed, what might not be expected from a thorough investigation into the meaning and bearing of the names? But now, if these

precisely what is required. His dialogues (which are frequent) are especially remarkable for the delicacy and truthfulness with which character and emotions find expression in them." (Canon Driver, p. 112.) Again, "The literary style of P is strongly marked. If J be free, flowing, and picturesque, P is stereotyped, measured, and prosaic. The narrative is articulated systematically; the beginning and close of an enumeration being regularly marked by stated formulæ. His descriptions are methodical and precise. When embracing details, emphasis and completeness are studied. Hence a thought is often repeated in slightly different words. A direction is followed, as a rule, by an account of its execution, usually in the same words." (*Ibid.* pp. 112, 122.)

have a meaning, it is only reasonable to infer that that meaning has a design and an influence which, if we have not yet discovered, it is clearly our duty to search for. Every other word in a Hebrew sentence is supposed to have its peculiar *meaning* and application, and no pains is counted too great to find this out. For this purpose all the cognate languages are studied, and human skill is put on the stretch, as when men dig for gold. There is no Hebrew word, down to the smallest particle, that has not during this century undergone such treatment. What, then, of the genuine *meaning* and *bearing* of Elohim and Jehovah, especially as these come out by the best of all tests—*usage?* Are these great words alone of no practical value? Is it enough to dive learnedly into their etymology, and then give them in charge, as to all actual employment, to certain unknown annalists, who for some unknown reason chose them respectively for their escutcheon, after which they went on to attach to them two variant styles, distinguished by certain "well-marked characteristics," of which all we are told is that there they are quite in their own line, but with no relation to the *meaning* of the names from which their authors derive their own standing on the Biblical field? Is it thus that we treat the different titles of a fellow mortal? If our Queen be designated by various titles, have these no special design and no definite meaning? And if it be thus as regards all words in good writing and all titles in common speech, then surely we may believe it cannot be less with *Elohim* and *Jehovah*. It may be late in the day to say this. And yet it cannot be too late to say that by all propriety of language there *should be*, and by all religious principle there *must be*, a very real, deep distinction between the design and bearing of the names, as, for example, if it is said "I have gotten a man from '*Jehovah*'"; and "'*Elohim*' hath appointed me another seed"; '*Elohim*' said to Noah, "The end of all flesh is come," and "*Jehovah* shut him in"; or, "Then

began men to call on the name of *Jehovah*"; and "Enoch walked with *Elohim*." To say that the variant names came simply from two different annalists is but a learned way of covering up our ignorance, by alleging something of which we have no information. And even if the annalists were different, why should not the different names have different meanings and purposes in this Bible case, as they certainly would have in any other?

As regards our first question then, namely, What connection the theory can show between the *names* and the *styles*, it is plainly reasonable to suppose that there would be such a connection, and that of a most decided kind, for "the differences of style" which lie at the basis of the theory are "not isolated, but singularly persistent in their combination in the two groups of sections" respectively. Not only might it have been expected then that the closely-associated points in the respective groups would have displayed a real affinity in thought among themselves; but, above all, that these points would show a vital alliance with the Divine names, respectively, in connection with which it was that they got their present place. Hence would appear the necessity of ascertaining, first of all, the meaning and design of the names, if there was to be any enquiry into the association alleged; and, secondly, the necessity of tracing out the relation of the association to the names. And yet it so happens that nothing of all this is done by the 'critical' theory. Neither such meaning of names, nor such relation of associated style is made, for a moment, the subject of enquiry. Nothing is made less of, in short, than that on which by all right everything should depend; for the names are treated rather as dead posts, of a certain colour, for living figures to move around, than as parents of living children—all to dwell harmoniously together.

Now, if this be the course that true criticism and sound reason equally prescribe for ascertaining the connection between the *names*, and *the real facts* as to style, let us see the course

that the Scripture itself distinctly sets before us. And here we are met, at the very outset, by a fact of the most patent sort. In chap. i. we have a *single thing*, pure creation; and a single *Name*, the simple *Elohim!* The proper inference is that the name suffices for the thing, and is thus appropriated to it. The action is all simplicity, without much variety; and this might have been taken as a good account of the style. Again, if the action shows much of repetition, it is only fit that the style should do the same. Once more, the creative act is, in its last stage, pure anthropomorphism; and this, of course, is represented under the creative *Name*. But this is not in accordance with the 'critical' view, which very much confines this sort of representation to the Jehovistic sections; in contradiction to this most intense of examples, "Let us make man after our image." And how can anthropomorphism be more marked than in the strongly Elohistic portion, "*I will look* upon the bow, *that I may remember*." (Gen. ix. 6.)

What follows in the second chapter is as complex as all this is simple. Here we now come upon a large work of arranging and organizing. Law is proclaimed, and the judicial functions exercised. Life and death are set forth. Society is established, and Adam's place in the world determined.

In the third chapter all this is developed with extraordinary rapidity, and to a surprising extent. Temptation, sin, fall, social disorder, guilty alarm, meeting of Judge and criminal, sentence, mercy, redemption, promises and threatenings—the whole following in close connection. All is new. Something has come in quite different from creation-work. Hence a name is wanted to keep pace with the altered condition. That name, from beginning to end of this development, is a complex one—*Jehovah-Elohim*. Observe, not simply *Jehovah*, any more than *Elohim*, but Jehovah-Elohim—*i.e.* Jehovah, who is the Elohim of creation—not a new God, for Elohim was the true and only God—but (so far as information is now to be vouchsafed) One, with the *Jehovah* character *combined* with the *Elohim* one. It

is this that makes the difference. And what is the Jehovah character? Now—just as in this divine handbook throughout —no direct answer, like what human handbooks furnish, is given to this question. The facts are the answer. For these enclose the view intended for us of the action of *Jehovah-Elohim*. But that will differ from the more simple *Elohim-Creator* action, just as the position of Lawgiver, Judge, Redeemer will differ from the more simple position that preceded. Such action then, displaying such views, will draw out corresponding sentiment towards the character presented. In that sentiment will be deeper views of the relation of man to God than the fact of creation supplied. Such views will clothe themselves in the language that becomes them. And thus, if the stronger sentiment, which the Jehovah action calls out, evokes a more graphic style than the Elohim action did, the reasonable mind will fall back on the Jehovah *idea*, rather than on any Jehovah *document*.

Now this might be carried out from the worship of Cain down to the last dealings of Joseph. As for Cain, his ambition was to put on the highest style of religion, which led him at once to worship *Jehovah*, as Lawgiver and Redeemer. As for Joseph, his life in Egypt was naturally of an Elohistic cast; but very special pains are taken to represent his own Jehovistic character. (Chap. xxxix. 2–5.) As to the Babel-tower, it is plain that the offence was directly against *Jehovah*—and why so, if not for the specialty of the character? hence the style of the narrative. *Idea*, not *document*, rules it. So the God of Shem is *Jehovah*—and "Blessed be He." The mere *document* view would bear no meaning here. Time goes on. 'Jehovah' is forgotten. But the buried seed must spring up. And out of Abraham the whole harvest comes. Still, of course, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob know the double character. For without this they could know *neither* properly. Their *God is Jehovah*. Let it be asked now, Whether this does not lift the subject immeasurably above the document level? If we go to Jacob and

Esau, we find that the one knows the two characters alike, and is moulded by the knowledge; while Esau adheres scrupulously to his simple Deism. As to Laban and Jacob's wives it would be extremely interesting—were this the place for it—to study their expressions.

And let it be well understood that, if there be within our reach any sound principles for our guidance, they must be sought in the first three chapters of Genesis. There they are as having come down from heaven. It is *revelation* at one bound, as soon as the Divine Being, first written of as 'Elohim,' begins to deal for man, and commune with him, as, at the same time, *Jehovah*. There is no explanation given, only the fact. And now, at once, there comes into use, for the highest purposes of worship and devotion, that mysterious name, which was to hold on its course, as a bright guiding star for man, till the depth of it should be laid bare as the "I AM WHAT I AM"; and the fulness of it should be poured out in the WORD MADE FLESH. But that there was already both light and power in the name should not be denied in the face of the Mosaic record of its employment. And, while no document or editing can come near an explanation of this, there is one reason which makes it clear that Elohim Himself revealed it, and that the use, at once made of it, both set agoing all its subsequent employment, and told what the Holder of it was pleased to communicate for the time. The reason is that nothing short of revelation introduced it. Hence its superlative value. And, as to etymologies, whatever these may profess to tell, they can tell positively nothing of the indissoluble association up to its highest principles, and down to its lowest ramifications—that came to be bound up with it, from the day of its appearance in Genesis. Apart from that we can make nothing of it. But if this Jehovah name be purely a divine revelation, and dependent on that for its entire value, absolute and relative, then is it for us equally a matter of faith only. Now *there* is the difficulty. Were it a matter of philology,

or any sort of literature, the thing would be different. But as a matter of *faith*, and the field for the faith so enshrouded in mist, that is more than the philosophical intellect can bear. And so it must labour in the fire, and seek light from any spark of its own kindling, rather than accept of the revelation, with that simple faith to which the most genuine reason absolutely shuts us up. Thus we hold it as enough to vitiate any theory about the two styles that it should ignore the meaning and application of the divine names.

We come now to the second question, namely, How this theory was to be worked out? Now it must have been either (1) through a series of Documents handed down from age to age, or (2) by Tradition. That the critics accepted of the first we should almost have believed from their frequent reference to 'Documents.' But it rather seems they mean to signify that 'Tradition' only was in operation until J, E, P, each gathered that into his own collection, reserving it for the final Redactor to compact their various collections into one. So clearly natural, however, is the first branch of the Alternative, namely, that J, E, P would make use of previous 'documents,' that it is impossible to pass it by.

Now the problem is how to adjust the documents to authors or editors, so distinctly marked. The date of J for the framing of *his* documents is given as about 800 B.C. P is a priest about the time of Ezekiel or later, but on no account earlier than the fall of the monarchy, and the establishment of the full theocracy in its place, with the chief Mosaic Instutitions, for which the previous ages leave no room. Then, after P, at a time unknown, comes the unknown final Redactor who took up J, E, P, to mould them into a continuous whole.

We begin with P as laying the framework of the Pentateuch, and as being credited with the first chapter of Genesis. So the question is, Whether he had any documents for that work? And this question, whether taken up by critical writers or not, is necessary as expressing a fair hypothesis on their

side, and as representing the natural and customary method of transmitting facts over such a stretch of time. Now what *was* the document, and what its value, that P had to start from? And did it really embody those traits which mark his style, as Genesis i. is said to do, traits said to have come from his priestly position, with its specialties of thought and action? Such is the question. But what his priestly position had to do with his work in Genesis, or what priestly documents or traditions there could be, when there were no priests to issue them, does not readily appear.

Passsing from the first chapter, P leaves us, we are told, at chapter ii. 4 in charge of J, who will give us a fresh view of Creation, together with accounts of Paradise, the fall, and the worship of the two brothers; P returning at the end of chapter iv. only to tell us that Eve said, "*Elohim* hath appointed me another seed." Chapter v. with its genealogies is of course his, and the notice of Enoch's walk with *Elohim*, while he comes in in one of the parallel versions of the Deluge, but on what ground is not easily seen, when the only priestly matter there, namely, the notice of the *sacrificial* animals, is left to J, not to him. Meanwhile, it is very striking to find that he whose very function it was to detail what was priestly has no word about the Fall, or the Redemption promised, or that which forms the grand prototype of all priestly worship—the sacrifice of Abel. And this is the more remarkable, as there is nothing in chapter ii. iii. to shut out the Elohist any more than the Jehovist, the Divine name actually being *Jehovah-Elohim*. Thus it is that, in spite of the priestly work in which sin and sacrifice were so prominent, these are actually made less of in Genesis than by the more secular Jehovist. So until the end of the book the only link between P and what is priestly would seem to lie in the matter of *circumcision*. And even that was national rather than priestly, as being designed for all Abraham's descendants, and was even introduced with "*Jehovah* appeared unto Abraham." (xvii. 1.)

And now as to the Documents, let us try to understand about their making, beginning with P.

What, then, can we do but suppose that some one would begin by collecting such facts as suited him, and giving them out in a document in the P style, with its *Elohim* in Genesis, and a sufficient proportion of the associated features to distinguish him? These features or characteristics we may speak of as *a*, *b*, *c*, *d*, *e*, *f*. The work being thus started by a recording of matters, recent enough for credibility, there is next wanted a successor in the series, carrying out the same plan for his own time. He must have the art, however acquired, of following his predecessor in the same spirit. Now if there had been any college, convent, or caste for the training of such writers, we might imagine something of the sort, though the genuine reproduction of the minute style alleged would have been hard enough even then. But, in the certain absence of all such means, we are shut up to an amount of independence between the writers, in which imitation would be impossible. And yet the view given of them by the theory, as now taken, inevitably suggests to us so many moths weaving with great exactness their literary cocoons, age after age—coming from Adam and Noah—down, down, and still down, till the Priest of Ezekiel's time came forth to collect and combine this multitude of documents, or any proportion that may seem reasonable.

Now that these various characteristics of P should have been thus kept up by documents in any tolerable manner is beyond all thought. It is what men never dreamt of in any department but this of the Pentateuch.

And yet this is not all, for, parallel with this Elohistic P, there has to run on his fellow Jehovist, with equal peculiarities. Let us call them—*g*, *h*, *i*, *j*, *k*, *l*. And he too, if we are to have documents that are historical, has to collect his materials from contemporary, or not too remote, memoirs. Now these two styles must be sufficiently exact to be distinctive of the 'measured prosaic' P, and the 'lively

picturesque' J. And the two lines have to run on, till one collection is taken up, about 800 B.C., by the collector for that series J; and the other, till it is laid hold of, and similarly treated, by the unknown but noted Priest about B.C. 600. And then there still remains E, the minor Elohist, to collect another class of documents similar to J, and about the same time. Now we are not saying that anything so chimerical is maintained by our 'critics.' We only mean that this would be the only way of getting real information through documents. It is, of course, put out of the question by nothing less than the mathematical doctrine of the Calculation of Chances.

We now suggest—as the readiest, and it seems the only way of getting rid of this absurdity without discarding the 'Document' view—that the Documents came as simple and colourless chronicles into the hands of those collectors who, instead of inserting them as they got them, worked them up into their respective styles—stamped upon them, in a word, their own features. The lively J turned, we suppose, what was commonplace into his lively style. And the prosaic P was faithful to himself, we imagine, in doing the converse. Thus, though tradition could be at the best but a faint reflection of the truth, we are now asked to accept of that as reflected from the character of the collectors!

Now, first, this is plainly nothing better than a notion in the air, put forth for the meeting of our blank ignorance. It is said indeed with great positiveness that our present books demonstrate the fact of this as their groundwork. And such a style of assertion always makes an impression.

We go back then to the first and leading example of the Elohistic style in the first chapter of Genesis. Now, the fact is that the so-called marks of P here, instead of ending in mere style, manner, or garnishing, would constitute the entire portion; for one of his peculiarities is to *relate Divine directions*, and *then execution*, in the same terms. But it is

THE KING'S INSTITUTE

The King's Library

just this that *makes up the chapter.* Then there are the eighteen repetitions (such as "God saw that it was good"; "It was so"; "Evening and morning," &c.) Take away all these distinctive marks of P, and there is *no account left*—nothing for P to work upon.

And the same may be said of the composition of J in chapter ii. It is the fulness of expression that discovers him—such as *planted*, *fashioned*, *breathed*, *placed*, *took*, *set*, *brought*, *closed up*, *builded*. Now these expressions only represent as many *facts*, and if you take away these you take away the very substance of the narrative. It is these that bring out the character and stamp of the Jehovist. So that the original document either had them or not. If it had, the work was done previously to the first edition. If not, there was no material to work upon. And it is plain how the same is true of chapter iii. Take away all that is said to belong to the J style in word, spirit, manner, fact, and there is nothing left for a compiler to alter, only to adopt. The backbone is gone, and the limbs also. So of chapter iv. the same might be said.

These cases then are not casual but radical, and representative of a large class. And the principle is the same, whether as applied to an entire case or to any single feature of it. Thus it was *Jehovah* that was the *Elohim* of Shem. There was nothing in this to be modified, or added to, or taken away from. So it was before *Jehovah*, not Elohim—this same God of Shem — that Nimrod acted with such peculiar repugnance and contempt. It was still against *Jehovah* that the Babel-builders were rebelling. Hence it was *Jehovah* that came down to confound them. It was *Jehovah* that said to Abram 'Get thee out of thy country.' Or, coming back to chapter xv., you cannot subtract its peculiar characteristics and yet leave a story behind. So, if you part chapter xxii. between J and P and abstract the distinctive marks insisted on, you leave nothing for any of the writers to do. Or take Eliezer in chapter xxiv. It was evidently his radical purpose

—and no addition by any compiler—to keep referring all to *Jehovah* — whether alone or in company. And Laban—though certainly no Jehovist—kept up for his own reason the same style. Or take the speech of Judah (Genesis xliv.), which, as we saw above, has won so much literary credit for the 'Jehovist,' and now we can see that no compiler, but the original reporter only, whether by document or otherwise, is responsible for those peculiarities, for without them there would have been no speech at all. The language is far too fresh and original for any other view. Pare it down till it becomes fit for J's genius to act upon, and there is nothing left.

Such is a sufficient sample of the plea supposed, that the distinctive marks of J, E, P might have been added by the compilers to the original documents. The view amounts, in a word, to this, that there can be no separation in many, perhaps most, of the narratives, between their substance and style. It may be said, on the other hand, that such a change from original sources is only the rule in all good historical writing. One, for example, like Macaulay, gets hold of all sorts of raw material and weaves it into a splendid web simply by style and setting. Now between the two cases there is nothing in common. The Englishman, so far as he confines himself to *history*, is only presenting the facts in his own style. By this he may succeed in setting them on fire, but he adds nothing to them. The fire may burn itself out, but the facts are what they were. In the other case, the style would not be the setting, but largely the making of the facts—not a secondary, but an original part of the case.

In connection with this, let the essential change in the 'marks' of P from *Elohim* in Genesis to *Jehovah* in Exodus, etc., be well considered. Was it not needful, according to the entire theory before us, that this change should draw others with it? And yet there are said to be none. P maintains his own *Elohistic* character, with *Jehovah* as the title that

regulates his narrative. There needs no other proof of one thing at least—that the Names, which certainly should have been first, count for nothing. And this might of itself render the theory suspected. Meanwhile, after this undoing of the *Genesis* attachment of 'Elohim' to P, and the *Exodus* linking of him to 'Jehovah,' one is constrained to ask what security we have for the aggregation of features so freely apportioned the two names throughout.

In connection with this 'aggregation of features,' it cannot be amiss to refer to Genesis i. and ii. There we have a comparison betwixt the *bare* style of the Elohist and the *full* style of the Jehovist, as shown in the latter's long array of verbs, such as 'plants,' 'brings,' 'builds,' 'walks' (nine in all) contrasted with the two, 'created,' 'made,' in the former case. Now, in so simple a matter, we might have expected accuracy. But the fact is that, instead of the *two verbs* of the Elohist, we have verbs expressing the direct Divine acts, moved (brooded), said, saw, divided, called, gave, blessed, set; while, equivalent with acts, are the orders to gather, appear, rule, bring forth, yield, give light, be fruitful, multiply, replenish, subdue.

Such is our answer to the plea, as supposed to be urged in the interest of the Theory which we are opposing, that the original documents, though coming colourless and unstamped into the hands of the original compilers, derived their characteristics eventually from them.

There is another way, however, of accounting for the transmission of the original materials to the hands of the first collectors; but which, after what has been said of 'Documents' will not need lengthened discussion. It is *Tradition*, and seems to be the view now commonly adopted. Thus Dr. Driver (p. 118): "In the early stages of a nation's history, the memory of the past is habitually preserved by oral tradition; and the Jews, long after they were possessed of a literature, were still apt to depend much on tradition."

Now this is not in the least degree questioned. It is possibly in some measure true, even to this day. The question is, If *that* is the source of the writings before us? Again (p. 110)—"J and E appear to have cast into a literary form the traditions respecting the beginnings of the nation that were current among the people—approximately, it would seem, in the early centuries of the monarchy." As to P (referring to Exodus xxxviii. 24, &c.; Numbers i. 26; vii.; xxxi.)—"It is probable that in many of those cases only particular elements of the representation were supplied to him by tradition. His representation as a whole seems to be the result of a systematizing process working upon these materials, and perhaps also seeking to give sensible expression to certain ideas and truths (as, for instance, the truth of Jehovah's presence in the midst of His people, symbolized by the *Tent of Meeting*, surrounded by its immediate attendants in the Centre of the Camp). His aim seems to have been to present an *ideal picture* of the Mosaic age, constructed indeed upon a genuine traditional basis, but so conceived as to exemplify the principles by which an ideal theocracy should be regulated." (*Ibid.* p. 120.) At this rate, of course, the history is more or less gone; as this writer seems to admit, when he adds, "It is difficult to escape the conclusion that the representations of P included elements, *not, in the ordinary sense of the term, historical.*"

Our concern, then, is with the working out of the Tradition principle. But, before entering upon this, it is fit that we look well into the tradition idea itself. And the first thing that strikes us is the desperate improbability of the thing. There now had passed ages teeming with inscribed memorials of many sorts, and here was a people well acquainted with them in various forms. Egypt, rich in everything of the kind, had been the cradle of Moses and Israel. Abraham's country had produced its Oorfa monuments. And Canaan itself had its *City of the Book.* And there were men like Enoch and Noah, and Shem and Abraham and Joseph, who had witnessed the greatest

wonders that earth had ever seen; and yet not one of them had made out a memorial of them fit to go down to posterity, and make up, with other such, a solid record for those who so much required it. Such men, we thought, had lived and died, burning to "publish the memory of His great goodness," and, with such a heart, unable to restrain man's natural desire to record what greatly concerns himself. "Oh that mine enemy had written a book!" was only a natural expression of the common expectation to see in writing what has pressed much on the mind. And yet good and great men like these were content to fall asleep over their privileges, and consigned the mighty doings of their God to any wind of tradition that might chance to blow them on. And then came Moses, the man who had more to record than any man who had ever lived; Moses who had spoken into action the plagues of Egypt, and walked through the Red Sea, and stood face to face with Jehovah, and communed with Him at Sinai, and got commissions the strangest and grandest that ever were heard of, and yet he recorded nothing of it all, only left it to be taken up, and wafted on by tradition's breath, whatever its mood for the occasion. Yes, and after *writing in the book* the word against Amalek, and "the statutes and judgments" of the Covenant, and one or two other things perhaps, then to abandon to trustless tradition all that "Jehovah spake to him," even when the clear, sharp notices of the *speaking* seemed to signify that the *writing* was now inevitable! But enough, we have, it seems, overrated Moses; we have taken him to be more of a man than ever he was. And now it turns out, as the result of the new criticism, that he whom we had always taken for no common man, was by many degrees below a very common one. Moses was content, we now find, quietly to mention to those about him what Jehovah had spoken to him, so that they might repeat the same to others, and leave it to tradition to do all the rest. And so Tradition was expected to do for the Sinai revelations what the receiver of them was himself too

cold or careless to undertake. And tradition, more inclined to act than Moses, did take up the burden, and bear it forward on its tongue.

And then after Moses came Joshua, and all the earnest men under the Judges, and Samuel, and David's men, and Solomon's, and all the good men, including Elijah and Elisha, with his 'sons of the prophets,' down to Zedekiah, who "had understanding in the visions of God"; and not one of them all thought of bridling and fixing these traditions about their master, Moses, till the unknown J and E set about the work, somewhere about 800 B.C. it is said. And still the most important of the floating matter was allowed to float on before priests and prophets, before Isaiah, Hezekiah, Josiah, until about two centuries after the others. Then the zealous, obscure, idealizing, 'prosaic' P put out his hand to catch what he could, and bridle the fast fleeting story ere it should entirely die out. And so, with all his faults, we are inclined to say, All honour to the unknown Priest for his intentions. But the well-known Moses, to whom was committed so much on man's behalf, and who so unaccountably left it to shift for itself, *him* we find it hard to honour. From the new light now shed upon us, it would rather seem that the truest epitaph for Moses would be, "Here lies the most honoured, and the most neglectful of men."

Now the result of the whole, viewed 'critically,' would be this, that Jehovah did indeed speak to Moses; but what this particularly means we cannot tell, and what He said we do not know. We only know that there is no confidence to be put in what He is said to have spoken. And yet, in spite of all, that mysterious P, who so piously took in hand what he found floating about has managed, somehow, to give us an account so simple, truthlike, and living, that we cannot but believe, when we ponder it, that this is precisely what "Jehovah spake unto Moses." For high as heaven is above the earth, are these thoughts above all that ever came from the minds of priests.

They are God's thoughts indeed. He it was that spake them, and Moses, if we know anything of mankind, was not the man to sit down and fling them to tradition. And thus we gladly conclude that it is P, not Moses, that forms the myth.

This then we give, with all confidence, as the real idea of Tradition. And Professor Driver, noted for moderation among the critics, has frankly told us what it has done, or not done, for us. He seems pleased, on his own part, with the 'ideal picture' that P has given us of the Mosaic age, and the non-historical history bequeathed by him to us. He considers the inspiration of the Pentateuch as safe as ever it was, and regards it as an important boon that, while we have lost nothing of the real Scripture, we have gained much in the understanding of its form, composition, and dates.

Just one word more. It is not Moses only that we have here to take account of, we have Jehovah also to reckon with. And however Moses might fall below the man, we may not therefore infer that He could fall below the God—in first giving out His revelations, and then abandoning them to the wind of Tradition.

If such then be the *idea* of Tradition what will be its *operations?* Of this we need not say much after our discussion of the document hypothesis, for what was too hard with solid memorials could not be easier with the floating breath of Tradition. It is very easy to speak of traditions as "common in the origin of nations," and therefore to be expected here. But the traditions that have been common do not in the least approach to what is now alleged. They have not had to do with *such* matters. Nor, as now proposed, have they been left to do the entire work of transmission by themselves. They have simply been one of the factors, allowed a place in matters infinitely less momentous.

Just take then the first of these points; namely, that the ordinary traditions have never been *such* as we want now. For what, according to the 'Document' idea, would be the thing

wanted in the 'traditions'? Nothing less than this, that they should have come down the stream of the ages, bearing in their breath the singular freight of the threefold Compilation peculiarities. But this being more glaringly impossible than even with the documents, we can only fall back on the second supposition, and imagine that they came all colourless and unstamped to the ears of the Compilers, from whom they got that varied impress of features which is held as sufficient to shatter the Pentateuch into fragments. But if this, as we have seen, was impracticable with *documents*, it must have been equally so at least with traditions. It is the wildest possible supposition, to begin with, that three men getting the same, or kindred traditions into their possession—instead of recording them substantially as they got them—could take no rest till they turned them into the new and distinctive shapes of their own personalities, as if their respective characters had furnished a ready-made mould for the new impress. Nor does it help us to bring in any company of associates to assist. For then the unity of the mould would be hard to effect in proportion to the number of the helpers. And then the same impress must have been kept up in the three lines from the oldest of the traditions to the latest. The family likenesses must have been stamped on them all so clearly that there could be no missing of them by trained eyes, nor any risk of mistake in breaking up the Biblical story into numberless fragments, and portioning them out to different authorships, so as to match the likenesses. Thus the traditions that came unstamped and colourless into the hands of our Compilers, not only got from them a certain stamp and colour—which would be a large allowance—but the same stamp and colour in each line respectively—and in all the individual cases—each bearing a sufficient measure of distinction to set it by itself—and that from creation downwards without a break—and all to such a degree that *they* are pitiably blind at the best who cannot see all this!

Such then would be the operation of the Tradition *Principle*. Nor do we see any escape from its notorious impracticability, except by giving all principle to the winds, and abandoning ourselves to the unreasoning sentiment that Tradition itself—principle apart—was equal to the undertaking.

It seems plain also, when speaking of compilers, and their self-stamped features, that there is the appearance here and there of a misplacing of the features. Thus the "ideal picture of the Mosaic age," with all its traits, is a highly poetical and even romantic conception, and not a fit work for "the measured, prosaic" P. But then there were times when he got unusually aroused, and allowed himself, contrary to his very sober habit, to speak of Jehovah as "appearing to men," and "going up from them." (Genesis xvii. 1, 22; xxxv. 9, 13; xlviii. 3; Exodus vi. 3.) "This, however, was only *at important moments in the history*"; and "he gives no further description of the Divine appearance." "It is only in the supreme revelation on Sinai (Exodus xxiv.; xxxiv.), and when He is present in the Tent of Meeting (chap. xl.), that he describes Jehovah as *manifesting Himself in light and fire*, and speaking to Moses as man to man (Numbers vii.; Exodus xxv.); or in order that the people may recognize Him." (Exodus xvi. etc.) "Wrath even proceeds from Him, as a destroying fire and death (Leviticus x.; Numbers xiv.; xvi. etc.). But anthropopathic expressions of God he avoids scrupulously; and even the anthropomorphic are rare." And this, after Genesis i. 26, and ix. 12–17. Where then, after this, shall we look any more for the "*prosaic, measured*" P, with whom we had become so familiar? Enough to add that, if once we remove those strong traits of this famous compiler, we undo the very fabric of the facts, and leave nothing on which to base the character at all.

Thus we have examined, all round, the basis of the Jehovah-Elohim theory. We have heard what its advocates have to say

for it, and we can imagine nothing more. The ground must lie in *document*, or *tradition;* and these, as coming into the editor's hands as we now have them, or without any of their distinctive features, and receiving these from him. Thus the theory of the names, with their associated style, constitutes an essential part of the root of the entire system. And only if the root is alive, can *that* be living fruit which is supposed to constitute the system. Now *that* fruit is set before us in immense profusion, and in a guise of great plausibility. The distinctive points of style, by which the Pentateuch is broken up into numberless fragments, are made to consist in thousands of phrases and peculiarities altogether bewildering in their pretensions. But with all this, the fruit can be no better than the root. If this last be dead, so must be the other. It is too late to answer, "No—such fruit can never be dead Look and see, if it be not living fruit." But to look now is too late. Already we have been round and round the tree, and have digged well beneath it, and have examined with all possible care what professes to be the root, and we have found no root at all, only a mass of tangled wire.

Let this, then, suffice for argument. 'Criticism' has forgot itself in this raid into so novel a region. Hitherto its occupation had lain in other lines. And, by poring over documents, traditions, monuments, and such like, it had done excellent service in discovering truth. In the present case it was a new problem that had sprung up, and, emboldened by past success, it was tempted to venture on the solution. But instead of attempting its utmost with the far-reaching significance of the Names on which all depended, it has attempted an unheard of experiment, and in that has got beyond its depth. And having taken those names as mere symbols of a theory, it has constructed a certain highly artificial system which can only lead to perplexities worse than it was intended to relieve from. Thus it goes on talking of certain fantastic forms as of

real guiding authorities, speaking of them in a mysterious cabalistic style, which has bewitched many, just as in a great ecclesiastical system, the conjuring up of the idea 'Church' has done. It is in either case the marvellous power of imagination that has conceived the device. And in either case has the higher reason stooped to be the slave of this inferior faculty. So in philosophy, legislation, history, religion, and much of what is called Science, the achievements of imagination are notorious. The very ablest pen might now employ itself well in giving us a book styled *The Natural History of Imagination,* as once we had such histories of 'Enthusiasm' and 'Fanaticism.' Such a one might perhaps depict the attempt of the Jehovah-Elohim 'Criticism,' where the professing agent is Reason, but the actual one is Imagination, with its schemes which are (we venture to say) impracticable and impossible, and, with all their parade and pretence, can offer to our hunger nothing better than the mirage of the desert.

Meanwhile, if I may not speak to the Critics, I will ask intelligent readers to say what they think of the possibility of working out on any of the conceivable lines this successive series of peculiarities. I will ask them, if it does not seem that the theory, take it as you will, is a psychological hallucination? I will ask further, if they think it right to sit still, while men, all round, are busily disposing of Old Testament materials—as much in the dark to those outside their circle, as the witch in mixing her herbs, or the astrologer in talking of his conjunctions? For the fact is that the critics now sit down, and finding what seems to them a want of coherence in two contiguous verses of the Pentateuch, instead of patiently examining the case, pronounce at once that one of the verses, expressing some of the occult properties of the Elohistic series, is out of its place beside the other, which, for similar reasons, belongs to the Jehovistic succession. Hence

the two must part company at the bidding of this new master. And thus, by change upon change, chapter after chapter is broken up, and what *was* a history is now a medley of fragments, with neither historical basis nor credibility left. And this has gone on till the solemn "Jehovah spake to Moses" has become the emptiest of myths. And, strangest of all, the simple-minded are blandly assured (and many of them accept the assurance) that it is *only the form, not the substance*, of the revelation that has been altered by the new treatment. And all this is done in a tone so positive as to signify that no person of reason can possibly think otherwise. Hence very many have felt compelled to accept the 'criticism,' while many more are declaring that they do not know what to believe. Meanwhile the present design is to persuade thinking minds to pause and join in an earnest attempt to reason the matter fairly out before giving themselves up to the dreary infidelity that must result from the present rashness. And, above all, let those who are in doubt cry with all intensity of soul, "O send out Thy light and Thy truth. Let them lead me; let them bring me to Thy holy hill and to Thy tabernacle. Then will I go to the altar of God—to GOD MY EXCEEDING JOY."

EXODUS:

AN AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF MOSES.

Part First.

From the First to the Second Leaving of Egypt.

Chapter ii. 11—xiii.

I. Moses, as from Chapter ii. 11 to iv. 18.

THIS we take as commencing from chapter ii. 11 ("when Moses was grown," &c.), and, for what precedes, it is easy to account. Now, it is a striking fact that, while the birth and adoption of Moses have been told, as independent matters, there has been nothing said about his boyhood or youth—not one of the marvels, without which legend is never attempted—and which, in other accounts of the same man, have not been omitted. As for the present narrative, it passes, by one bound, from the opening of the life to the ripe manhood.

It by no means follows, however, that we are to discard, as purely fabulous, the account in Josephus of the Egyptian expedition under Moses against the Ethiopians, for that in itself is far from unlikely. It was such an undertaking as his ardent mind would naturally grasp at, and for which his singular capacity might well gain him the appointment. Besides which it may well have been one of the divine

means of training him for his future work. It may have been to this that Stephen alluded when he spoke of him as, in his early years, "mighty in words and deeds." It seems also to accord well with what, by the same authority, was in the mind of Moses when he made his first attempt to liberate his people. "He supposed they would understand how God, *by his hand*, would deliver them." Nor is it out of place to remark that his marriage to the Ethiopian king's daughter, according to Josephus, *may* have been the circumstance which comes in so unexpectedly in Numbers xii. 1, "For he did marry an Ethiopian woman."

We are now told in a few lines of the new thought that had taken possession of the mind of Moses. And each of the lines is a picture in itself, while the style is what has always been regarded as a sure token of the eye-witness.

"It came to pass in those days when Moses was grown, that he went out to his brethren, and looked on their burdens." He was now breaking off from his adoptive mother. A higher ambition than to be called her son had seized him. The thought of his brethren had more power than all thought of an Egyptian crown. So he must go and see them, and, as "he looked on their burdens, he spied an Egyptian smiting a Hebrew, one of his brethren. And he looked this way and that way, and when he saw there was no man, he slew the Egyptian, and hid him in the sand." Who then but an eye-witness could have this minute acquaintance with the case? And what witness but the actor himself knew all that is here quietly implied? Or who else had the self-denial to withhold all expression of feeling in such circumstances? A marvellous reserve force was that which so kept back all that any common narrator—to say nothing of romancer—would have made the burden of his story!

Fired by the success of this mistaken assault, Moses went out again, with his original view, on the next day. And now it was two *Hebrews* that were quarrelling. So, taking time to

look through the case, and seeing clearly that one of them was wronging the other, he sharply asked him, "Wherefore smitest thou thy fellow?" Upon which he is asked as sharply, "Who made thee a prince or a judge over us? Is it to kill me that thou *speakest* * so, as thou killedst the Egyptian?" Does it not then almost seem as if these questions, while showing how strongly his brethren resisted all claim on his part to jurisdiction over them, yet imply acquaintance with him as a very important person? It is not "Who art *thou?*" but "Who made thee our judge?" And this free question of thine—is it meant as the prelude to the killing of me next? There must have been an appearance of rare authority—and, we are almost forced to suppose, of something more—about the visitor who is thus questioned. What but the manifest means of acting out a hostile purpose could have called forth such language? And is it not just as thus equipped, that Moses would actually appear in these novel visits, that is, as an Egyptian officer, with his weapons, for deeds like these, done or dreaded? This would bring out a remarkable harmony between what is here told and what, although not named, is certain as to the position of Moses at this time.

It is important to notice here how sparing the writer is with his words, and how suggestive these are. There is not one in excess, and not one with less than its full meaning. Is this the style of a stiff document, or a floating tradition, or a casual reporter, or any but the one actor?

Another point, but not for the last time. Moses is a bold man and a patriot, but no boaster. His zeal for his people consumes him, and it sometimes outruns his prudence.

We proceed with the history. Verse 15: "Now when

* This is clearly the sense of the Hebrew, and is so given in the Dutch Bible. Such extreme exactness of language—together with the other minutiæ just noted—furnishes a strong argument for personal record, and against *tradition;* that is to say, *for autobiography.*

Pharaoh heard this, he sought to slay Moses." That is all. When he returns to his own actions (supposing him to be the narrator), he is more minute. "But Moses fled from the face of Pharaoh," which seems to imply that he was occupying a position not far apart from him. And it was to Midian that he fled, not resting, it seems, till he found a safe retreat there, when he sat down by *the well* which he first reached.* What follows is next told, and that, in the easy and complete manner of one who has been through it all. "Now the priest of Midian had seven daughters; and they came, and began to draw [from the well] and filled the troughs, to water their father's flock." We can see that it would have been bad courtesy for a fugitive stranger at once to volunteer his help to *seven* maidens, as Eliezer and Jacob had done to Rebekah and Rachel. But when 'the shepherds' began† to drive them away, then Moses *rose* up,‡ and helped them. "And they came to Reuel their father [note how the eye-witness brings us into the heart of the scene], and he said, How is it that ye have come so soon to-day? And they said, An Egyptian delivered us from the hand of the shepherds, and also drew for us enough, and watered the flock."

See what follows, and say if the story is less than life-like. "And he said to his daughters, And where is he? why have ye left the man? call him that he may eat bread. And Moses was content to dwell [stay] with the man: and he gave Moses Zipporah his daughter. And she bare him a son, and he called his name Gershom." ("Stranger there.") It might

* Our two versions have done much to confuse the sense by reading that "he dwelt in Midian," and (after that) "sat down by a well," as if that had been an incident of his abode in Midian. The word is the same in each case. He *sat down* in Midian (*i.e.* rested, halted; so Luther and other German versions). See Gesenius for the sense of the original, "And he *sat down* by the well."

† The Sept. marks the uncompleted action in each case, *They were drawing*, ἤντλησεν, and *were driving away*, ἐξέβαλλον.

‡ Surrexit, Vulg.

have seemed as if his present abode was now more of a home than Egypt. But no, Israel was not in Midian.

There comes now a notice, apart from Moses himself, which yet goes to the depths of his soul. The years in Midian have only intensified his concern for Israel, and now God's time has come for the close. So (verse 23) "it came to pass, after these many days (Sept. and R.V.), that the king of Egypt died: and the children of Israel sighed by reason of the bondage, and their cry came up to God. And God heard their groaning, and remembered His covenant." The long-looked-for time is emphatically announced. Strange if any one, with the least sense of vital relationship in narrative, can find in what follows any gap to make room for another pen—"Now Moses kept the flock of Jethro, his father-in-law, the priest of Midian." The name calls for a word. For *he* is now Jethro, who before was *Reuel;* the reasoning, according to a certain style of criticism being, Different names, therefore different documents. An easy way of settling a matter so important! But is it not much easier to say that Reuel is the family name—Reuel, the father of the seven daughters, Reuel, the father of Hobab (Numbers x. 29); while Jethro is simply the *official* name—always "Jethro, the priest of Midian"; or, as Josephus gives it, "Raguel, the priest of Midian." And it is of consequence to know that the word 'Jethro,' by the most natural derivation, would mean 'his Excellency.'* In the same way the king of Egypt, whatever his own name, was *Pharaoh*, while *Abimelech* was the title for the Philistine king, and *Cæsar* for 'the Roman emperor,' and *Padishah* (*pater rex*) for the Persian king.

Moses then, as now related, "came to the mountain of God —Horeb-ward." Such is the best English. For Horeb must be taken here as the region containing the different peaks, rather than a single mountain.

We are now introduced into a new field of action—the direct dealing between Moses and his God; and the style we

* So Fürst Concord., *vorzüglicher.*

now find as suited to this, as it was to the other; for it was, and is, the style of simplicity and ease, propriety and dignity, each word in its place, and Moses equally in his. Style can go no further than this, and it never falls short of it. Hence men, the most devout and learned, have for ages recognised that the style was simply the counterpart of the facts and truths which it enclosed. Of attempt at explanation there is as little as ever. Fact is everything; the writer never straining to get above, any more than chancing to fall below, himself. Nor is it any literary genius that makes him thus equable, but truth and truth alone. A supreme moment for humanity has come, a moment whose weight he can feel, though but partially appreciate. And on the work before him he appears to us as entering, with the same quietness as the solid earth on its daily or yearly round. But Moses in this work is no dead machine nor winged angel; he is a Hebrew sent to instruct his people, and through them the world, in language intelligible to all.

II. First Visit to Sinai.

Chapter iii.—iv. 20.

A word here as to that style of direct communication between man and God which we now encounter. It is not with Moses, however, that this commences. It is quite as distinct in the case of Adam. (Genesis iii.) And the same continues down to the latest prophet. Such is the Old Testament style, which under this form appears only occasionally and very partially, under the New (*e.g.* "Arise, Peter, go with the men"; "Fear not, Paul, thou must be brought before Cæsar"). It presents us with nothing less than the view of man, as practically speaking into the ear of God, and God speaking to the mind of man. By what means this was effected we are not told, nor are we curious to ask. We are content to take it as the development of the fact that man was made in the

image of God, and thus fitted to 'walk' and talk 'with God' —the condition realized so fully in Enoch. How much there may be at any time of the really subjective in such circumstances it is not ours to pronounce. For even as regards that, we should have to make room both for the influence of external fact, and for the objective action of God. Hence we know of no alternative but to take the narrative as it stands, and to interpret the language as in any other case. This we know, that when man truly prays he truly speaks into the ear of God; and when God gives *direction* to man, He equally communicates His own mind to His creature. What if we conclude that one great object of the Old Testament was to present to us in solid concrete, this very view of religion—thus inscribing upon imperishable monuments this great principle of the kingdom of heaven? Nor can *we* be called losers, even if the mode of communication has been changed, since the King came down to commune with men, and then—leaving behind Him those who were to record and expound it all—went up, as Himself the new channel for all the fresh communication between heaven and earth. Meanwhile, we know no other reasonable way of treating the constant assertion that "the Lord spake to Moses," than to accept it as we should do a similar statement of any other sovereign. As between the two cases there would be room of course for extreme difference. But this we must hold, if we accept the statement at all, that such 'speaking,' with the correspondent *answering*, forms an essential element in the narrative of Moses.

Nor do we find here any preliminary difficulty. For the natural thought is that, if God would really have communication with man, He would do so in the style at once most divine and most human. And this is a view as appears to us the contrary of 'difficult.' The difficulty would rather be that God should allow it to be said that He had spoken to Moses, and Moses to Him, when the only reality in the matter was *the asserting of a thing that never took place.*

Moses then having gone through the simple business of leading the flock to "the mount of God, at the back of the desert," now met with something transcending all past experience. (Chap. iii. 1–6.) It was the appearing of Jehovah's angel, from the midst of the bush that burned, but was not consumed. "I will now turn aside (said Moses) and see this great sight . . . And when *Jehovah* saw that he turned aside to see, God (Elohim) called to him out of the midst of the bush, Moses, Moses. And he said, Here am I." "And he said, I will now turn aside . . . for he was afraid to look upon *Elohim*." [It was not for him to say that of *Jehovah*.] Let us also pause, and see the style of the account. For a true story may be expected to give some signs of truth, and it would be something unusual indeed if a false story of this character gave none of falseness. "Out of the midst of a bush: and he looked, and, behold, the bush burned with fire, and the bush was not consumed." A veritable legend, it will be said. But say again, Would legend have stopped here? Would it not —with such boundless call for the marvellous—have put something legendary into the very bush, the fire, the burning—yes, into the very 'looking' of the shepherd—and why not into the behaviour of the flock itself? We can just imagine what St. Anthony's biographers, and all of the desert school, would have made of a thing like this. And borrowing a hint from the practice of that school, 'Criticism' might now say, "Yes, he had been so long nursing up his feelings, whether in Egypt or Midian, that feeling and expression were both ready to burst out at any new sight or fancy acting on his brain." But no—Moses is not excited. And as to his presuming too eagerly to apply the present vision, he is decidedly slower than we should have counted on. For while the design of the bush-symbol was so very plain, the meaning did not readily occur to him. Hence, "I will now turn aside, and see this great sight, why the bush is not burnt." Marvellous coolness! enough to satisfy any 'criticism,' that Moses at least was under

no excitement. And who but Moses can be the narrator of it —Moses the eye-witness, Moses the self-witness—Moses telling what he only could tell?

It is no story for tradition this. Tradition could never have carried down such a picture on its tongue. And if it be said—Granted; but it came from the lively pen of J, in his adapting of the narrative—then the answer is easy. Take away the features thus supposed to be added, and nothing is left. And if the compiler be not J, then the critical theory has none at all equal to the work.

So when Jehovah—yes, Jehovah, Israel's God—saw that he turned aside to see, then 'Elohim'—God, not man, not angel —called to him out of *the midst* of the bush—not from its side, observe, but from its very heart—saying, 'Moses, Moses,' who answered, 'Here am I.' So little has this great sight unsettled him.

Let us just observe here, in connection with the critical theory, how freely the two names, Elohim and Jehovah, are interchanged in verses 3–7, but without the slightest trace of change in the author. In verses 11–14, on the other hand, we can see the propriety of keeping to Elohim, with a view to that new revelation of 'Jehovah' which was just at hand. (*v.* 14.) And this is a case given for double authorship, on the strength of the naked circumstance, that the two names thus present themselves; and that, in spite of all that speaks for the *perfect unity of the passage*. And this is the easy way in which this momentous conclusion is reached. "In chapter iii. the main narrative is *Elohist*, with short passages from the *Jehovist*."* (Canon Driver, *Introduction to Old Testament*, p. 21.)

Moses now details what was addressed to him—and yet not every word, as we may judge from some expressions which

* As it is important to know what the new criticism is with which we are dealing, we quote what Wellhausen says about Jehovah. "Jehovah is to be regarded as originally a family or tribal god, either of the family to which Moses belonged, or of the tribe of Joseph." As to his *action*

seem to intimate a gap—but all that the reader could well take in, and amply sufficient for the writer's object. The account is this: "And Jehovah said, I have seen, I have seen the affliction of My people in Egypt . . . and am come down to deliver them. . . Come now therefore, and I will send thee unto Pharaoh, that thou mayest bring forth My people out of Egypt."

Such is Jehovah's call to the honest shepherd in Midian. And the account is as credible as an account could be—unless we choose to hold that this interchange of words between the Divine and human makes it incredible. How then is the call taken? "Who am I, that I should go unto Pharaoh, and that I should bring forth the children of Israel out of Egypt?" For a very different matter was this errand to the king from his own original plan. Besides, Moses is older now, and he feels staggered by the weight of the task held out by the announcement, "*I will send thee.*" Hence, instead of the loyal, "*Here* am I," it is the questioning, "*Who* am I?" It seems then as if this must have been really spoken by Moses, because really felt; and really written because thus spoken. Now if *he* is the narrator, we can hardly think so badly of him as that he made up the speech, in mere affectation of humility. To suppose, on the other hand, that he did speak the word, and committed it to some one through whom it came to be first buried in a document, and then unearthed by another, is to take a very mean view of him. Or, if we prefer to take the matter out of the hands of Moses altogether, it was little likely that any admiring chronicler would have given currency to such a speech, even if true; and certain that he never would have coined it if untrue. What remains then but that Moses did fail in faith, as here stated, and wrote the failure for his people's instruction?

we are told: "Alike what was done by the deliberate purpose of Moses, and what was done without any human contrivance, by nature and by accident, came to be regarded in one great totality as the doing of Jehovah for Israel." (*Encycl. Brit.* xiii. p. 397.)

In return for the timid "*Who am I?*" Moses gets the full assurance, "I WILL BE WITH THEE." And this he follows up by a question, at once natural and remarkable. It was natural that in going to the people he should desire to tell who had sent him; and yet remarkable that any other name should be wanted after the one just given, "The God of your fathers," so well known to them as *Elohim*, *Jehovah El Shaddai*, *Adonai*, *The Most High God.* But something with a deeper and fuller meaning, it seems, was desirable, and for this Moses, by a certain spiritual instinct, begs. To supply this want, and thus furnish a lesson of peculiar value, had evidently been the divine purpose, and the request now made serves for the ripening of that. And how does the development come out? Is it by proclaiming the name as 'Universal Creator,' 'All-bountiful Provider,' 'All-ruling Sovereign,' 'All-gracious Father,' or 'Lord of heaven and earth'? No, none of these, natural as they were. For such announcements had been made already. And the present one is new, though it seems less natural than the others; it is one, in short, which no one would have dreamt of, and to which, when first spoken, some of the wise might have objected. They might say, or at least feel, that it savoured more of the unpractical abstract, than of the really useful, or even that it sounded too like grammar or metaphysics—I AM THAT I AM. That was the name, and with nothing to simplify it, unless it was the repetition of the I AM. Nor was the view much altered by its actually wrapping up in itself the solution of the name JEHOVAH. No, surely, this is not the answer that Moses would ever have contrived to his own request, "*What shall I say?*" Nor is it imaginable from any lips but Jehovah's own. And yet what name could have approached it in meaning? I AM THAT I AM; that is to say, "I am the Self-Existent, the Eternal, the Independent One, Almighty, Wise, Sovereign. *In* Me is all Being, and therefore *from* Me as well. And with all *Being*, all *Blessing.* I alone suffice for Myself, because in Me is the Fountain of life; and from the same fountain flows

all the light and life of My creatures. Myself dependent on none, all depend on ME, the First Cause, and last End of all—even on Me, the Self-glorifying One—to glorify whom is the rightful business and sure blessedness of all whom I have made—I AM THAT I AM." It is the grandest, fullest, clearest, simplest, the most ennobling, and most satisfying view of the Eternal ever given to man. It has its mystery, as it ought to have. But that is only as we look upon something and say, "Yes, I know it was created—*how* I cannot tell; but I none the less see it, handle it, taste it." In the same way we can deal with the mysterious I AM THAT I AM. The ancient, or modern, sage can make his Deity say, "I am the Soul of the Universe; I am the Unknown and Unknowable; I am the Absolute and Unconditioned; I am the great Pan, from which all comes, and into which all returns." Or, "I am something that makes for righteousness." And such speculations have been called sublime, with the certain result that, the more of such thoughts the more of bewilderment. But of the Mosaic revelation the development is this, "Hast thou not known, hast thou not heard, that the Everlasting God, JEHOVAH, the Creator of the ends of the earth, fainteth not, neither is weary? There is no searching of His understanding," etc. (Isaiah xl. 28–31.) And this is what God's Church has made, and will make, of I AM THAT I AM. Such is the majestic growth developed from the simple seed sown at Horeb on that day!*

Thus unsolicited and unexpected came this great revelation. It is not thus that religion-makers have generally gone to work. Their habit has rather been to seek, and to get, what they wanted. The contrary style of Moses indicates a contrary mind, and, in looking so keenly for anything out of

* Here is another view of the relation of Jehovah and Israel. "The name 'Israel'" (says Wellhausen, as above) "means El does battle," and Jehovah was the warrior *El*, after whom the nation styled itself. Again, "For Moses to have given to the Israelites an enlightened conception of God would have been to give them a stone instead of bread."

order, it is only honest that we should keep as open an eye on whatever is straightforward.

The next paragraph at once supplies a manifest lesson in this line, for, just after the portion now reviewed, there follows another (*vv.* 15–18)* which might, on a hasty glance, be taken as a duplicate of it, and therefore as the product of another document. By looking closer, we find that the two paragraphs are not what we perhaps took them for, namely, *two similar notices of one matter*, but *each a notice of a separate matter*. The first is simply God's declaration to Moses of His design to deliver. The next is the divine instruction to Moses how to convey the intelligence to the people. It is entirely out of place to ask, Why then the second of these when the first might have sufficed? For surely God may be allowed to regulate such a matter without us. Meanwhile let it suffice that the two portions, though necessarily similar, are given on *different occasions*. The first is fitly closed (*v.* 14), with the revelation of the great NAME, as the ground of all; after which the second commences (*v.* 15), "And God said *moreover* (ōdh) to Moses." That is, it is a fresh communication, though still at Horeb. And this is precisely the natural and reasonable view of the matter. But it is neither reasonable nor natural to parcel out between two document-makers what is not a single story—even though the material may be identical—but a double narrative of the opening and closing facts of the same business, and that with the most delicate differences. For, besides being expressly given to Moses as *a second communication*, the variation between the two accounts is not what two documents would at all naturally have shown. No two writers, in that line, could have been in possession of that delicate difference between the two pieces which would have led them respectively into the two separate accounts. It was

* And so it is that verses 17, 18 are "assigned to E on account of their imperfect connection with the context."—CANON DRIVER.

to Moses only that Jehovah had first announced what He was about to do *for Israel*, without a word of direction to them. And it was equally to Moses that He 'moreover' said, "Thus shalt thou say to the children of Israel." And see how, to the last line of the second communication, it continues in the same style, down to the order for the Hebrew women to ask for the Egyptian jewels—a matter clearly unfit for this place, except on the ground of its being the direction, by anticipation, for the final act of the people. And the same may fairly be said for the two portions upon the whole. If now this matter with all its delicate differences could have been so ill met by 'document,' what shall we think of *tradition?*

Another word here, ere we proceed. This narrative, as all *of* Moses, is either *by* him also, as everything seems to indicate; or, which is unlikely in the extreme, by someone who got it direct from him. As to the responsibility of it, that clearly belongs to him. Now the whole style is that of fact and truth. It is a style not known in any other connection. Whatever man has done, or may come to do, he has not yet managed to write falsehood thus. And such falsehood as this would be! Falsehood gross and shameless, for the pious purpose of showing how man, made in God's image, holds communion with God—spirit with spirit—both freely speaking, and solemnly spoken to! Falsehood taking Jehovah's name in vain, and furnishing the ground for the fancy that He, the God of truth, was now dealing with Israel for their deliverance! And the so-called Moses is so weak, or wicked, as to accept and give currency to the scheme! It is easy indeed to salve the character of Moses by enlisting in his favour the blindness of an illiterate and indiscriminating age. But it is in vain. Tried by any test of the highest moral chemistry, Moses is not indiscriminating. Instead of being one to be patronisingly pitied for his antiquated surroundings, he is rather fit to stand on the highest pedestal for the admiration of men with far more of learning and pretence!

Moses credulous and indiscriminating? So it may be said; but only by running counter to all appearance and evidence. Rather let us acknowledge how we are all indebted to him for the unsurpassed pattern, not only of piety and patriotism, but of fairness, boldness, and caution. Moses, the victim of imagination? Yes, imagination may so *talk*. But for imagination to *do* what Moses did, or falsely to write it, if *never done*—this was an experience not yet known among men. So we accept it as the conclusion equally of religion and reason that those communications at Horeb between Moses and his God are as authentic as they are edifying. He has related the deepest revelations with the same simplicity as the smallest circumstances. He has told what belonged to his own experience—first, as concerned himself; and in doing this he has supplied us with large material for the same experience in ourselves. He has fully represented his personal part in the peculiar redemption of his day. And by this he has brought us within the temple porch and music of that greater redemption of which he was the distinguished herald. Now that all this, as it stands related in Exodus, is other than true we have not the power to imagine.

III. The Commission to the People.

Chapter iv. 1–17.

Now this is clearly no appended document or tradition, but entirely of one piece with the communication that precedes—a living member, in short, growing out of a living body. One reason for saying this is that Moses receives this new message, while still at "the Mount of God."

"Now Moses *answered and said*," etc. But this has no place here except as the direct consequent of what precedes, and therefore presents a direct negative to the change of authorship. Taken verbally or morally, it can have no other reference. Such

is the first living link. The next is the surprising readiness of Moses to doubt and object, after the decisive assurance, "I will be with thee." Then there is the very peculiar rejoinder. 'What is that in thine hand?' 'A rod.' 'Cast it down.' It is now a serpent, and Moses flees from it. But his discomfiture is short-lived. 'Putting forth his hand,' and 'taking it by the tail,' as commanded, it is a rod again, for doing the grand work in store. Now all this, symbolically taken, had doubtless the highest significance. And Moses, as at once a born Hebrew and a cultivated Egyptian, had no difficulty in applying the symbolic point to the case in hand. It is by no means needful that the matter should be *before us* with the same clearness. But even we can see enough to satisfy. We can see that, with this power over the rod, Moses was made a match, at least, for those Egyptian magicians. We can see too that he gets a full guarantee for Jehovah-power over the serpent in the Egyptian Pantheon. Nor need we quite overlook what is perhaps a tacit reference to victory promised over Pharaoh himself, according to the view of such passages as Isaiah li. 9 with xxvii. 1; Ezek. xxix. 3. One thing, however, is very distinct—Moses must be trustful and bold, and then the full victory is his. Yes, and it is after the weakness of distrust that the victory of faith comes; just as here there is the fleeing from the serpent when only looked at, but the complete mastering of it when once laid hold of. In such reflections there was nothing fanciful.

As to the second sign, it would not be difficult—when we take leprosy as significant of a living death—to show how strikingly that might apply. But it would be wrong to stake the case, in any degree, on any ideas of our own. Enough for us that Moses, at least, was in a position to see through the reference. Nor could he fail to see that, as in the first sign, the second result would be an entire contrast to the first.

As to the third sign—the water becoming blood—there can be no question. For the Nile, besides being the life and pride

of the Egyptians, was one of their principal divinities. And yet even *it*, at the word of this Moses, shall be turned into loathsome corruption. Now these signs are all deep and far-reaching, and seem like nothing so much as that they were divinely imparted to Moses, with a view to the people's confidence in his mission.

It might be supposed, then, that further objection was now impossible. But no; it seems only to pour itself out more freely against this stout wall set up to stop it. "Oh, my Lord, I am not eloquent, but am slow of speech." "Who hath made man's mouth; have not I, Jehovah? Go, therefore, and I wilt teach thee what thou shalt say." Can objection, then, object after this? It can. "Oh, my Lord, send by whom thou will send." No wonder that the divine anger is really kindled now. But a happy thing for Moses, and for us, that grace prevails, and appoints Aaron as spokesman for this trembling brother. We only say again in regard to it, What is this, what can it be, but the autobiography of a perfectly upright man?

Part Second.

From the Return to Egypt till the Final Leaving of it.

Chapter iv. 18—xii.

I. Moses Leaves Midian.

THE rest of chapter iv., from verses 18–31, consists of short notices of what happened till the putting of the case before the Hebrew elders. The account may seem disjointed, and perhaps it is. But criticism can gain nothing by that here. For the scattered sentences can have got their present place only as fragments of fuller truth. Nobody making up a story would have made so disjointed a one. And as little would any professed collector have combined fragments in so little of an artificial manner. As for *Tradition*, that can do least of all, whether picked up by E, or any other. But the chief actor, entering into the spirit of each incident, might well have strung together the whole on the thread of what he knew as the true design of all. Only this vital circumstance, the mind of Moses, looking over all, and reflected from all, can perfectly explain to us the arrangement as we have it. And this, too, will explain, as nothing else can, that life-like, troubled scene of a domestic sort between Zipporah and her husband in regard to the circumcision of their child. How this should ever have been told, except that it was true, it would be hard to show.

The other particulars that make up the fragmentary narrative are all striking, and would of themselves furnish important items of coincidence. But space permits not to enter into them. We may however mention them.

(1) Moses returns from Horeb to Jethro, and mentions his desire to return to his brethren—in which Jethro cordially acquiesces. (*v.* 18.)

(2) There is the new commission to return to Egypt, with the intimation that he may do so with safety. (*v.* 19.)

(3) Moses putting his wife and sons on the ass sets out, *taking the rod of God in his hand.* (*v.* 20.)

[We must give here a sample of the arbitrary, we might say, vexatious, style of the critical objections. "In the existing narrative (says Canon Driver, p. 21 of *Introduction to Literature of Old Testament*), verse 19, from its contents, is not fitted to be the sequel of verse 18." Is it not fit then to state a *fact*, and then a *previous* fact as the reason for it? And what but this do we find in verses 18, 19? Professor Driver knows well that the Hebrew, having no pluperfect, is shut up to the simple *past*. Thus he knows that 'said' in verse 19 is just as truly '*had said*.' And he knows that the 'and' equally means 'for'; so that we have only to read, as the sense points out, *For* Jehovah *had said*, etc. Hence, of the two facts, the later comes *first;* viz., the request to Jethro; and the earlier, *second;* viz., the intimation, "For all the men are dead that sought thy life." Whether, I now ask, does this way of handling the facts look more like a living Moses or two dead authorities of any kind?

Another grave critical objection is this, that "the two verses state an *alternative* ground for Moses's return to Egypt." Now we can see *two harmonious* reasons, that is all. One is the Divine intimation, the other is the reason given to Jethro.

The 'critical' solution of the fancied incongruity is this. "Hence the name Jethro makes it *probable* that verse 18 belongs to the same current of narrative (Elohistic) as iii. 1, and xviii." Thus verse 19 will belong to the Jehovist. And this is how modern criticism would break up the unity of the book!

To this it is added, "Verse 20 (at the end) *naturally* goes with verse 17." Naturally indeed as to thought and action.

But most unnaturally, if it be meant that it must have a place for it nearer 17.

Another remarkable objection is drawn from the commission to Pharaoh in verse 17. "Take this rod, wherewith thou shalt do signs"; and yet only one such sign has been mentioned in verses 1–9. The simple question is, Does the portion, 1–9, contain the whole account of the *signs done?*

Again, chapter iv. 21 mentions wonders to be done before Pharaoh, whereas 1–9 speak only of wonders for the satisfaction of the people. Was it 'unfit' then that Moses should be first bidden to do certain signs before the people, to whom he was to go first; and then the same before Pharaoh afterwards?]

(4.) Jehovah now gives him a special charge to work out before Pharaoh the signs committed to him—giving him as the reason for this that the king would not yield at once—"I will harden his heart." (*vv.* 21–23.)

[Upon this extraordinary style of dealing we venture a remark. It was certainly of vital importance for the display of Divine action that Pharaoh should bring on himself not one stroke but many. Each of these was designed as a lesson for that time and for all time. Now Pharaoh never had the mind to put himself right by a true repentance. And—however he might, if left to himself, have ceased from further oppression and so have got his chastisement lightened—yet the Judge of all, as He did not seek a merely selfish submission, so neither would He have accepted it. And hence He chose to shut up Pharaoh to his own chosen course, till it should end in the one result which was in the Divine view. Thus, and thus only, as we understand it, did Jehovah harden Pharaoh's heart, not by making it bad or hard—for such it was already—but by shutting it up to its own natural working in one line, and him to the inevitable result. And yet even if the expression does seem difficult to explain, and reconcile with our views of moral government—still does it sound much more like a Divine

judgment than the mistake of a man? For it certainly explains the action of God towards Pharaoh; while as a mere expression of Moses it would explain nothing.]

(5) The next word is still more a distinctly superhuman expression. "Thou shalt say to Pharaoh, Thus saith Jehovah, Israel is my son, my first-born." The thought is from the Divine bosom, and in no human mind was the word coined.

(6) Here comes in the circumcision story already referred to.

(7) *The meeting of the brothers.* (*vv.* 27, 28.) The coming of Aaron to Moses in Midian was by no means the most natural thing, and wanted an explanation. The easy and sufficient explanation is, "Jehovah said to Aaron, Go into the wilderness to meet Moses." Now this is but the fulfilment of God's own assurance to Moses, "Behold he cometh forth to meet thee." (*v.* 14.) These notices, though disjoined, look much more like the combination of separate references by one writer, than quotations from two unconnected sources. Thus Aaron arrived in time; not before Moses had left Jethro, but before he had quitted, for the time, 'the Mount of God.'

What follows is in accordance with the directions already given. So when the brothers reach Egypt they gather the elders, deliver the message, exhibit the signs, to the perfect satisfaction, for the present, of the Hebrews.

This section then (18–31), as we find, does not proceed in the unbroken strain of the one commencing from chapter iii. 1, but plainly consists of fragmentary notices. And what is the result? It is that we can clearly see one writer gathering up from his own knowledge the various important points needful to complete the story. And in this easy way he could combine them all. This, for any but Moses, would have been a difficult business, and one which there would have been little temptation to undertake, and not much chance of performing without confusion. To combine all was not so easy for an outside party as can be quietly assumed and loudly asserted.

II. The First Application to Pharaoh.

Chapter v.

Here we find as life-like a picture as can be imagined, and which has always appeared to thousands as an unquestionable transcript of reality. It seems indeed nothing short of an historical photograph. Hence we plead that the narrative is that of an eye-witness and actor.

Some of the points are these. (1) *The name of Jehovah* and Pharaoh. "Moses went in and told Pharaoh." (This of course is the direct sequel to the arrangement made with Moses at the last interview with his God, and thus serves for a note of *time.*) "Thus saith Jehovah, the God of Israel, Let My people go, that they may hold a feast to Me in the wilderness." The challenge is clearly of the most startling kind. And it is of the first moment that Elohim, the God of the Hebrews, should thus speak out—*under the distinctive name given at Horeb*—as marking him off from all other deities, and setting Him infinitely above the whole Pantheon. That Pharaoh should understand the significance of the word is not necessary; but it *is* necessary that both he and the world should know that the great Sovereign so named is *the God of Israel*, whom, while yet in the bondage of Pharaoh, He calls "*My people.*" Hence the call is one for the absolute surrender of Pharaoh to the *unheard-of Jehovah.* And such is the first public mention of the name after its proclamation—the first challenge to battle between Jehovah and man's deities. No mean proof that the present sentence is in its place, not as an offshoot from some lifeless stock, but as a growth from an organism. Yes, proof that the book knows nothing of the 'critical' disjunction between Jehovah and Elohim—only the original and never-forgotten combination of Jehovah-Elohim.

Pharaoh's reception of this message is equally significant. "Who is *Jehovah* that I should obey His voice? I know not

Jehovah." *Elohim* he did know, but not *Jehovah.* It is just as it should be from its late publication at Horeb. Can it be doubted then that Moses delivered the message just as he had been ordered? and that Pharaoh, provoked by the interference of this new God, broke out into his angry question, *Who is Jehovah?*

Pharaoh's resistance is now met by a repetition of the demand. "The God of the Hebrews hath met with us. Let us go, we pray thee," &c. Before this solid fact must all the pride of even this man go down. "Our God has met with us." Does this, we ask, look like life, or something less? And hear the king's reply to the new appeal. "Wherefore do ye, Moses and Aaron, stop the people from their works?" It seems from this that Moses and Aaron have not only delivered their message to Pharaoh, as related, but that they have been pursuing a concerted action, of which nothing had been said—that is, in the way of certain dealings with the people which had led to the circumstance here complained of. (*vv.* 4, 5.) Now who but an actor in the scene could have hit upon these delicate traits of reality?

(3) For this high offence the angry monarch imposes additional work, and all to be done within the same time, committing the order for execution to the Egyptian task-masters, and the Hebrew officers. (6, 10, 14, 15, 19.) All the particulars here noted suggest one thing, namely, a strictly contemporaneous account. But such is not the material that extraneous documents or passing traditions supply.

(4) The officers, doing their utmost to execute the impossible order, are beaten for their non-success. (*vv.* 15–21.) Here again every sentence is worthy of attention as contributing to a sound historical criticism.

(5) The officers appeal to Pharaoh, and that *personally*, as a close inspection of the statement shows. Being indignantly repelled, they meet with Moses and Aaron by the way, and bitterly accuse them as the cause of their new distress. (*v.* 21.)

(6) Moses himself now returns to the Lord, and addressing Him, not as *Jehovah*, but *Adonai*, gives way to a temper too much like the people's, "Wherefore hast Thou so evil entreated this people? Why hast Thou sent me? For, since I came to Pharaoh to speak in Thy name, he hath done evil to this people; neither hast Thou delivered Thy people at all." (*vv.* 22, 23.) It is an extraordinary exhibition of human nature, and as unlike as possible to anything but the stern relation of facts by the chief actor in the scene, who had so little occasion to make them worse than they were.

III. The Sequel to the Failure.

Chapter vi. 1–13.

After this human storm comes a Divine calm. This raises the narrative immeasurably above all methods of derivation lower than the declared one. Down to verse 8 we have the unbroken word of Jehovah. And what a word! It is that of a Father pitying His child and—while abstaining from rebuke—dealing with him in the purest wisdom, love, and patience. With this view He graciously rehearses the Horeb engagement, exposing afresh, as still most needful, the ground of confidence there opened up. "I am Jehovah: the same that was manifested to your fathers as *El Shaddai*, but by my name *Jehovah* was not (made) known to them." Thus after all the commotion that human tempers—Egyptian or Hebrew—had stirred up, as to the promised deliverance, the engagement stands as a rock.

Having thus received the commission afresh, Moses immediately conveys it to the people, who still refuse to hearken. (*v.* 9.) Upon this a new charge is given him for Pharaoh, and with a result that may well startle us. "Behold," says he, "the children of Israel have not hearkened to me; how then shall Pharaoh hear me?" It is truth again—truth alone—truth from the fountain-head—that ever made a story like

this. And Moses will give up his unbelief sooner than Jehovah will give up His word. So now a new charge, on the old terms, is given. The Divine patience continues its sublime course, and Moses shall go again to Pharaoh, and again and again, till his triumph be complete. (*v.* 13.)

Does any one now object to the number of these fragmentary notices—no less than four in five verses? But why object? No chronicler or collector, without much more of awkwardness than the present author had, could have made out a story by such means. Nothing can account for it but that the four matters *did occur*, and are set down in their own place accordingly. If now Moses has chosen to insert here a paragraph of genealogy (*vv.* 14–27), on what reasonable grounds can that be urged as an objection to the unity of the authorship? Does it not make the preceding all the more real and vivid? It is easy to conjure up the 'Elohist' as needful to account for a *genealogy*. But with what show of reason? What more natural than for Moses, after receiving these assurances of deliverance, to say, as it were, 'Now see the heads of the houses that were to share in the deliverance.' This surely is more reasonable than to suppose two such matters, as the arrangement for the deliverance, and the genealogy of the people, to be loosely thrown down into an unsymmetrical heap.* Do we not rather realize

* As for the genealogy in verse 20, there is a word to be said. We are not entitled to argue from chapter ii. 1, as so often done, that Jochebed was literally daughter of Levi. If she was the grand-daughter, or even great-grand-daughter, the expression would hold good by Hebrew usage. And as to being *sister* to Kohath, that may well be said of more relationships than one. And a very important thing for us is this, that in Numbers iii. 28 the number of the males from Kohath is given as 8600 —"the family of the Amramites" being one of the four sections making up the number—while the entire number of the Levites is 22,000. (*v.* 39.) Now this is really a small number for an entire tribe. But such a proportion for Amram personally, with only Moses and Aaron for his sons, is out of the question. Hence the term "families of the Amramites, Hebronites, &c," must have quite another reference; and seems to indicate that "the *four families*" spoken of had other sources than merely Amram, Izehar, Hebron, Uzziel (*v.* 19), the sons of Kohath.

vividly once more the organic connection of the portions, when we find the writer, after bringing down the genealogy to the latest, thus laying down the bond betwixt it and the deliverance? "These are that Moses and Aaron to whom Jehovah said, Bring out the children of Israel from Egypt, *according to their armies*" (the armies of which the leaders have thus been named). "These are they that spake to Pharaoh king of Egypt . . . these are that Moses and Aaron." (26, 27.) If these notes are lost upon *us*, we may at least allow their value to the first Hebrew readers. Nor have we either right or reason to object to the repetition once more, whether it be of the actual charge to Moses, or only of the relating it: "I am Jehovah, speak thou to Pharaoh all that I say unto thee." (*v.* 29.)

[This portion then, chapters iii. to vi., we have examined from point to point, and seem to have found it to be one closely-knit narrative. We have found two notices of the revelation of the name Jehovah professedly different, and apparently strictly consecutive. The first occurs in connection with the appearance to Moses at the bush (chapter iii. 14), thus putting into his hand the grand weapon for the impending war. He then returns to Egypt for the real work, and is welcomed by the people as their deliverer. But their courage is broken by the result of the appeal to Pharaoh, and Moses himself joins in the blank despondence. Then again—but this time *in Egypt*—the great name JEHOVAH is rehearsed, as that of which the potency is just about to be displayed. (Chap. vi. 2–6.) This is the chain that binds together these chapters, and the hand of the new criticism has no power to break it. To enter minutely into the attempt (we refer to Canon Driver, as above, pp. 21, 22) would be tedious. It can only be glanced at. It commences thus: After assigning chapter vi. to P as the author, it is said that "it does not describe a *sequel* to chapter iii., but a *parallel* to it, and contains a partly divergent account of the action of Moses."

But not perceiving where the divergence lies, we cannot enter into it. The real continuation of chapter vi. is, we are now told (not chap. vi. 2, but), vii. 14. "For though the revelation in chapter vi. 2–8 *might* be taken as a repetition of that in chapter iii. the different style shows a different authorship." But we cannot proceed further, having, we believe, answered all, in our exhibition of the continuity of the passage. We simply offer this as a sample of the manner in which the attempt is made to break up the most compact portions in the Pentateuch].

This brings us to *the conclusion of the arrangements* for the dealings with the king (chap. vi. 30–vii. 9); which verses should, on no account, be separated. In regard to the first of them (chap. vi. 30), we can say, even without going further, Yes, much as we marvel at the resistance still shown by Moses, we can believe that the word was really spoken, even here again, much more easily than we can believe that it was idly introduced in this place. And then we can see in it another illustration of the extreme familiarity of Moses in his manner of dealing with Jehovah; and still further we can see in this his last objection the indispensable occasion for the full answer (chapter vii. 1–5) which follows the inquiry, "How will Pharaoh hearken to me?" Objection and answer are mutually necessary.

Exodus vii. 1–5. The objections of Moses are now overcome, and he is fairly launched on his work. And how overcome? The Divine patience is magnified, but Moses is humbled. For while he is, beyond comparison, the superior man of the two brothers, and is "made to be a god to Pharaoh," the chief speakership, for the present, is taken from him; and "Aaron given as his prophet." It is humbling indeed that the great man—the man of Horeb, who spoke so freely to Jehovah and Jehovah to him—the man through whom was given to the world the revelation of the I AM—that that man has succeeded, by his persistence, in getting himself excused from carrying the Divine message

direct to Pharaoh. Now for such a story the only motive could be truth, whether as regards the actor himself or any admiring chronicler. Fiction, on the part of Moses, could only have sprung from a self-exalting spirit; and the view here given leaves no room for that. There seems in fact to have been a constitutional defect leading this great man to shrink from the task assigned to him, and from which Aaron, his inferior, was free. In this there was nothing for him to be proud of, or, if unreal, to work up into a tale. If indeed Moses had been shrinking from danger and courting ease he would then have been before us as a different man. But instead of this he retains the first place in the embassy, and stands in the forefront of the battle. It is only the chief speaking that he has the special dread of. How then harmonise these delicate characteristics except on the ground that such was the very character of Moses—those deep feelings being known only to himself? On any other ground the partial substitution of Aaron is absolutely unaccounted for. And all the more that the Divine arrangement is expressly detailed as made in condescending kindness to the weakness of a man like Moses!

A further word as to the engagement here repeated, "I will harden Pharaoh's heart." This, we see, is to prepare for the resistance that is already certain, setting that in its true light as part of the Divine plan with a view to a more signal triumph (chapter ix. 16). That triumph will be a blessing, not for Israel only, but for Egypt itself, and the world too, if only taken as it ought to be. It is the grandest object lesson in that line ever exposed to the nations. And, as for Pharaoh himself, there is nothing here to make him worse than before. For he *hardens his own heart* as really (chapter viii. 15, 32); while the unusual expression, "*His heart was hardened*," will refer to the human as directly as to the Divine act. This last is carried out only as the direct retribution for Egypt's sin, and sovereign arrangement for the world's instruction.

One small circumstance here (vii. 7) seems worthy of mention on account of its very truthlike character. It is the age of the brothers. "Moses was fourscore years old, and Aaron fourscore and three, when they spake unto Pharaoh." It looks much as if this notice had its vital place in the narrative.

The first sign for the king is now given (vii. 9), and let us do justice to the manner in which it is told. As a matter of mere document or tradition, the natural, and we might say *certain*, mode would simply be to relate it as a thing that took place. But the present style brings much more of actual life before us. "Jehovah said . . . When Pharaoh shall say, show a miracle for you, then thou shalt say to Aaron, take thy rod, and cast it before Pharaoh, and it shall become a serpent." [Not *nahash*, serpent, as the sign for the people (iv. 3), but *tannin*, more of the dragon kind.] So they went in to Pharaoh and did so, the magicians' rods being swallowed up by Aaron's when they attempted to imitate his act.

Now all these separate points are, each of them, a separate naked fact, which either took place as told or not. One thing is plain, there is no room for that dressing up, or feature-stamping, which would afford any occupation for any of the collectors.

So far, then, as the *tannin* was symbolical of Egypt, as already pointed out, the victory was entirely Israel's. Now it is more easy to ask questions here than to answer them to certainty. Enough if we find the marks of living action, instead of loose composition. And one of these is the steady march of events down to the Passover night, and the Red Sea passage, with all that followed these. Except for this living action, the word of Moses should have been choked in its own unpretentiousness. To accept that word in its integrity involves our acceptance of the distinctly supernatural fact as to Aaron's rod. But our difficulty as to this is at an end so soon as we feel it to be still harder to accept the view that *such a narrative is false.* With some it is *possible* to accept

the miracle of the *fact*, but *impossible* to accept the enigma of the *falsehood*.

Is it possible now that criticism can be so ingenious as to say, 'See here the contrivance as to Aaron. For thus Moses becomes greater than ever, by getting his elder brother for a servant.' Why then not have told at once a tale that would have set forth that, instead of the present tale which could mean nothing but his natural and humiliating inferiority in speech, not only before Pharaoh, but his own people? (iv. 16.) But a man who had got, as he professedly had, those astounding revelations at Horeb, could surely gain nothing by himself retiring, even under the guise of humility, into the second place.

We notice in passing that the hardening of Pharaoh's heart is now noticed as first taking place after this sign. No mean proof that there was something in the sign both fit and sure to have served its end, but for the special course divinely adopted. And an extraordinary amount of imposition it would prove in the writer, if his account here is untrue. For first it is, "I will harden Pharaoh's heart" (v. 3); then, "He hardened Pharaoh's heart" (v. 13); and then, "The Lord said to Moses, Pharaoh's heart is hardened." (v. 14.) There is really something gratuitously wicked here, *if the Lord did not say this to Moses;* and if he did say it, then how much with it?

Thus we find repeated before Pharaoh the first of the three signs originally given for the people. Now it has been objected, as we saw above, that there is confusion between the two displays of the signs. But here, as in every case that we have yet heard of, such objections only recoil upon their makers. For the great difference that comes out between these two signs, as displayed to the people, and as worked out before Pharaoh, strikingly shows how the two sets of facts, instead of being variously told through the peculiar working of the editorial machinery, did really differ among themselves, through the internal operation of their living springs. Thus the

serpent sign for the people stops with the milder *nahash*, while the same for Pharaoh advances to the more formidable *tannin;* and Moses, instead of his former alarm, quietly stands by, while Aaron's rod devours those of the magicians. It does seem as if the difference here were more significant of fact than of fable. For why the two accounts, but for the two realities? In regard to the blood-water sign the same difference comes out, and even more strongly. The gravity of the event rises with the gravity of the situation. Meanwhile, the variations between the accounts in chapter iv. and vii. are here noticed, as radical indications of truth in both the passages. The *critic thinks* that manipulation made the differences. The *writer knows* that they were made by the facts of which *he* was the witness.

Chap. vii. 15–25. The first plague is now related. It is the crushing by one blow of the power and pretensions of Egypt's great river god, and calling upon her people to turn at once to Jehovah who is smiting them. So perfectly truthlike and lifelike is the account that the only alternative to believing is, that we do not believe in miracles at all, as many will say. Others again have said, and will say, We believe in all that is sufficiently evidenced, and we believe that the evidence here is all that the human mind has any right to ask for; because it is clear to us that the story is either a wild romance or an authentic history. And for the first of these ideas we have no room in our minds, for we can see with our very eyes the whole: "Get thee to Pharaoh in the morning" (is the Divine word to Moses); lo, he goeth out to the water, and thou shalt stand [with rod in hand] by the river's brink against he come"; reminding him of the disobeyed command to let the people go, repeating the same, and telling him that, in case of continued disobedience, the water of the river shall be turned into blood, with all the loathsome consequences. Thus Moses, regaining his proper confidence, gets the first place in this matter, while he is required still to employ Aaron for the execution of the

order. What, then, must have been the feeling that overwhelmed the spectators when, on that morning, they saw the Hebrew messengers waiting for the king's approach to the river, and receiving him by such word and act? Will anyone, with a true historical sense, say whether he can imagine anything in the way of legend or romance approaching to this —first in itself, and then in its whole surroundings? The consequence was that the Egyptians were shut up for seven days to such supply of water as could be had by digging about the river. As to the Hebrews nothing is said, and that is just one of the features of the story. Meanwhile, we may take the liberty of believing that, as the terrible infliction was *for* and not *against* them, so there were left to them resources from which the Egyptians were shut out. The magicians, however, having done something—we are not told what, or with what result—in imitation of the miracle, Pharaoh refused to give heed.

Such is the story down to the first plague. And there are three explanations that may be devised, but none of which it will suit. (1) It will suit no collection of documents. (2) Nor of traditions; for neither of these could by any possibility have preserved such delicate traits of life and circumstance. Nor (3) will it suit an autobiography of conceit and fraud, but only one of truth and soberness, in every line of which Moses is put in his right place, and Jehovah alone is exalted, and that by no apocryphal encomiums, but by the genuine homage of a creature who had the most intimate dealings with Him—just such dealings as must ever form the kernel of all true religion, even when to that there was attached more of the shell than there is now.

We cannot pass by a grave objection here made to the unity of the narrative, but which only verbally can have weight with anyone. It is the use of the two I's, Jehovah and Moses in vii. 17. "Thus the transition from the I of God to the I of Moses is abrupt, and, in the historical books, unusual. Hence

the suspicion arises that originally the subject of '*I* will smite' was *Jehovah* (as in *v.* 25 Jehovah smote), and that the words, 'with the rod,' &c., were introduced by the compiler of JE, from the other source used by him." That is to say, our present narrative would not be a narrative, but a conglomerate of scattered fragments gathered into a pretended whole.

Now it is quite true that this combination of the two I's is peculiar as a mere matter of grammar. But the suggestion made from *v.* 25 is out of the question; the matter is at once adjusted when we simply allow the manifest sense to do it. We have only to combine the clauses, "Jehovah hath sent me to say, *Let My people go*, that they may serve Me." (Where we have *Jehovah* both in the *third* person and in the *first*.) This is followed by the same Jehovah, still in two persons, "Thus saith Jehovah, In this thou shalt know that I am Jehovah." And now, instead of His continuing, "Moses will smite," He leaves Moses himself to say, "I will smite." In a word, it simply amounts to this, Thou shalt know that *Jehovah* is able to act out that great name by the fact of His sending me to turn the river into blood. And this is the whole plea for the disharmony! This style we should not call 'unusual,' but 'unique.'

IV. Plagues from Second to Ninth.

Chapters viii.–x.

The gradation in the direct speaking of Moses is instructive, and throws light on the autobiography.

He was commissioned at first, we have seen, to convey to the people the message of deliverance; when, pleading his want of power, he obtains the substitution, or co-operation, of Aaron. (vi. 6–13.) The same takes place in the mission to Pharaoh. (vi. 30–vii. 1, 2.) So the rod employed is Aaron's. (vii. 9–12.) Hence for the giving the sign of the rods and serpents, Moses simply accompanies his brother. (*vv.* 10–13.)

Then in the first plague—*The Water turned into Blood*—Moses is told to get to Pharaoh with the denunciation, while the execution of it seems to be by Aaron, whose rod is employed. (vii. 15–20.)

In the second plague, *The Frogs*, the engagement is still to Moses (viii. 1–4), while the execution is committed to Aaron (5, 6), after which Moses takes the chief place with the king. (*v.* 9.)

So in the *third*, *The Dust into Lice*, it is still 'Say unto Aaron.' (*vv.* 16, 17.) In the *fourth*, or *the Flies*, Moses both speaks and executes. (20–24.) After this the two are called, but Moses alone speaks. (25–32.)

In the fifth plague, the *Murrain*, Moses does all. (ix. 1–7.) And so in the sixth, after the two brothers had been included in the order to 'take the ashes of the furnace.'

In the seventh plague, *The Hail*, we have Moses only—the speaking to Pharaoh being full and bold (13–26)—till the king calls for the two, making confession, and asking for their intercession. And yet, in all that follows, we again hear only of Moses. (29–35.)

In the next, or *Locust plague*, both are before Pharaoh, and both speak; but Moses, while chief speaker, is *the actor*. It is *his* hand that is stretched out over Egypt. (x. 1–19.)

In the ninth plague, the *Darkness*, it is Moses to whom God speaks, Moses that stretches out his hand to heaven, Moses that the king calls to go, Moses that prescribes to him the terms of the going, while to him it is that Pharaoh says, 'Get thee from me, and see my face no more'; and it is still Moses that answers, 'Thou hast spoken well, I will see thy face again no more.' (*vv.* 21–29.)

In the announcement of the tenth, or crowning plague, in chapter xi., Moses alone is mentioned.

Now, the nice distinction in the notices which present this gradation in the position of Moses is truly instructive, and the explanation of it is easy. Of different authorship there is no

trace, for style cannot be more even, or narrative more continuous. For the same reason there is no call and no room for different documents. And still less can tradition be thought of; for the delicate variations entirely preclude it. There is just one thing that explains it; and that is, the moral development of Moses in the course of the transactions related. Having begun by trembling at the weight of the commission, he recovers himself as he sees the work go on. He that, in unbelief, had abdicated his proper place, has regained his faith and returned to his place. This accords equally with natural principle and religious experience, and yet there is nothing said about it; the ill-balanced vessel has simply righted itself. There is no shadow of conflict with Aaron, who has behaved with equal propriety, both in the advancing and receding stage; Moses had shrunk from the untried work, and has had his weakness most graciously allowed for. But now that the work has ceased to alarm him, his return to duty is fully accepted, and he, meanwhile, has learned most important lessons; he who had slain the Egyptian has refused, when bidden, to wait upon Pharaoh. The experience is humbling, but profitable, and nothing can be more truly historical than the style of the narration. Anyone making up a tale, by way of surprise, would, even in a more literary age, almost certainly have let out some hint about the changed conduct of his hero. But to go through the whole as naked fact—which, when looked into, becomes both so strange and so natural—this does bear the seal of truth. Hence our plea comes to be, not that there is nothing inconsistent with single authorship in the giving of the different views, but that we get an actual proof that *such is the authorship*. Different authors never could have thus compacted the two views; it required the man who lived the case to tell it as it is told here. We may venture to say that not even an authentic history of a later age could have given us the picture that we here have of Moses.

As to Aaron also there is something to be said. Im-

measurably inferior as he is to Moses, he is yet found equal to the task from which Moses shrank. A severe strain was this on the humility of any man, and yet Aaron is equal to it; for, when relegated to the second place, he quietly accepts it. The secret seems to be that he was of a less ardent and sensitive temperament, and thus more quiet and equable. Hence, seemingly, both his easy acceptance of the chief place, and his withdrawal from it when the worthier man took it up. And this is just the spirit that seems indicated by the general attitude of Aaron throughout the history. Hence would come the mind in which he met the demand for the golden calf. Hence, too, the manner in which he took the death of his sons —appalling calamity as it was—"Aaron held his peace." And with this would go the quiet manner in which, on the same occasion, he gave his answer to the hasty complaint of Moses, about the sin-offering goat, upon hearing which Moses "was content." (Lev. x. 16–20.)

Special Notices.

Such, then, may be regarded as a cardinal line of evidence in support of the belief that this book is a biography of Moses by himself, which, in short, it virtually professes to be; for many of the facts, as such, Moses only could know. And no supposition can approach in reasonableness or naturalness to the one that he too recorded them. To what has been said we only add a few scattered notices which point in the same direction, as matters which, but for their truth, neither would nor could have got where they now are.

Such are the following: "The Lord spake unto Moses, Say to Aaron, stretch forth thy hand," &c. (viii. 5); "Pharaoh called for Moses and Aaron, Entreat the Lord. . . . When shall I entreat? To-morrow" (9, 10); then "the magicians said to Pharaoh, This is the finger of Elohim," *i.e.* Deity. For as to *Jehovah*, that was a nonentity to them. (*v.* 19.) "Only ye shall not go very far away" (*v.* 28); "The Lord appointed

a time, saying, To-morrow the Lord will do this thing in the land" (ix. 5); "Pharaoh sent, and behold there was not one [of the Israelites' cattle] dead" (*v.* 7); "They took ashes of the furnace, and stood before Pharaoh" (*v.* 10); "The magicians could not stand before Moses, because of the boils" (*v.* 14); "Rise early in the morning, and stand before Pharaoh" (*v.* 15); "In very deed, for this cause have I raised thee up" (*v.* 16); "Send now therefore and gather thy cattle" (*v.* 19); "Entreat the Lord, for it is enough" (*v.* 28); "I know that ye will not yet fear Jehovah Elohim" (30); "The barley was in the ear, and the flax was bolled" (31); "Then Pharaoh's servants said to him, How long shall this man be a snare to us? . . . Knowest thou not yet that Egypt is destroyed?" (x. 7); "Before them were no such locusts, nor after them shall be such" (*v.* 14); "Get thee from me . . . and see my face no more," &c. (28); "And Moses said, Thou hast spoken well, I will see thy face no more." (29.) This did not mean, of course, that he should hear no more of his messages; for there were ways in which even Pharaoh might have to do that, otherwise than face to face, as hitherto.

V. The Last Warning.

Chapter xi.

The crisis has come at last. It is a new thing altogether in the world, and as entirely outside of nature's thoughts as of nature's operations, and yet it is told with the same ease as all the preceding. The style is still as free from commonplace and grandiloquence. It is exactly the clear, firm style that befits the communication, and bespeaks a mind in direct communion with the great Being from whom that came. A tragedy is now told such as no Shakespeare was equal to, and told with a realism that *he* might have given his genius for. No writer, in fact, has ever been heard of, or conceived of, capable of

putting forth an account like this, with no counterpart in reality. If it be said that there might be some moderate portion of fact to start the romance, the answer is, that while no one can give the least idea of what this 'moderate' should be, such an undertaking could only have led to the overwhelming confusion of the writer.

Look now at the story. First, Jehovah says to Moses (*v.* 1), "Yet will I bring one plague more upon Pharaoh," &c. Then there is the order (*v.* 2) for the Hebrews to beg for the Egyptian jewels, which, we may assume, commences now. And this is followed by a quite casual notice of a circumstance which is vitally bound up with the tremendous drama, namely, the favour now given to Israel, and the highest possible regard to Moses, throughout Egypt. (*v.* 3.)

Now for the communication. "And Moses said (*v.* 4), Thus saith Jehovah, about midnight will I go out into the midst of Egypt," &c. Moses said so, and to Pharaoh, of course, as he uniformly did, without which the word would have missed its mark. And yet we are not told—*as in every case hitherto*—that Moses *did speak* it to him directly. But this did not hinder him from speaking within the king's hearing, and behind such covering as the royal grandeur could easily employ. So the communication is boldly and clearly delivered—declaring how all the first-born should die—and there should be a cry unparallelled throughout the land, while not a dog should move its tongue against Israel. And then comes the formal address to the unseen king, "All these thy servants shall come down to me, and bow themselves to me, saying, Get thee out, and all the people that follow thee; and after that I will go out." It almost seems as if the very scene were before us. The screened Pharaoh—his own enraged majesty concealed—but his power represented by a company of courtiers before whom these stood—ALL THESE THY SERVANTS SHALL COME TO ME—and the issue of their appeal, *After that I will go out*—upon which the visit ends—"He

went out from Pharaoh in a great anger"; there being little reason to doubt that the anger was Pharaoh's. Yes, the anger was Pharaoh's, and he took means to make it known, and yet without a vestige of the violation of the order, '*See my face no more.*' Now all this I urge is inexplicable on any hypothesis of patchwork by document or otherwise, and inconceivable except as the narration from its own living elements of the actual work to be done by Moses. And that the *writer* too is the same may very safely be assumed; for no other man could, in a case so intricate and delicate, have thus, without a point too many or too few, so perfectly transferred himself into the place of the Hebrew leader. It was utterly beyond the power of any old Eastern dreamer to have so perfectly built up such life out of a past that was not true. Just look at that one inimitable trait of truth, "And after that I will go out," as the final word launched into the ear of the unseen king. Such is the triumphant announcement of this leader of a nation of bondmen that he will quit Egypt with every soul of his people by his own will, and at his own time, because such he knows to be Jehovah's will and Jehovah's time.

VI. The Passover Night.

Chapter xii.

Israel's time in Egypt is now at an end. Let us look well into the account.

v. 1. "Jehovah spake to Moses and Aaron in the land of Egypt, saying, This month shall be to you the beginning of months," etc. That which had hitherto been the seventh is henceforth—as the month of the deliverance—to be counted the first month. And it is no small thing, we know, that can cause such a change in a people's reckoning. Now, it is on the first nine days of this month that the present directions are

given; and before other ten days are over, the same month is to see the host of Pharaoh's bondmen become the nation of Israel.

v. 3. "Speak ye to all the congregation of Israel, In the tenth day of this month they shall take every man a lamb." There is something assumed here as not needing to be told—but which, if not true, would have called for strong asseveration —it is the new liberty of movement which the altered order of things, through the late judgments, had brought to them. Besides which, the very tone of the order is the genuine harbinger of a great event at hand; and the style, if the expression of a present fact, speaks for itself; whereas it is unaccountable, if disjoined from the fact by ages.

The first orders, then, are quite of an ordinary kind, just as, if keeping to the truth, they should be. They simply prescribe the sort of lamb to be taken by each householder, with the arrangement to be made with his neighbour in case of need. They were such, in short, as fitted the alleged occasion, and that only. The whole scene is before us, so that we can see all that was done, and hear all that was spoken.

The orders that follow are as special and novel as this first one is ordinary. The lamb picked out on the tenth day is to be kept up till the fourteenth, and then killed in the evening by the whole assembly. The blood, taken up in a basin, is then, some time before midnight, to be struck on the two side-posts and upper door-post of the house. Meanwhile the lamb is to be roast entire, and eaten in haste, with unleavened bread and bitter herbs, loins girt, feet shod, and staff in hand, as the feast of Jehovah's Passover, and in preparation for instant departure. "For I will pass through the land of Egypt this night, and will smite all the firstborn in Egypt, both man and beast; and against all the gods of Egypt will I execute judgment. I am Jehovah. And the blood shall be to you for a token on the houses where ye are. And I will see the blood, and pass over you; and the plague shall not be upon you to destroy you,

when I smite the land of Egypt. And this day shall be unto you for a memorial; and ye shall keep it a feast to Jehovah throughout your generations; ye shall keep it a feast by an ordinance for ever" (*vv.* 12–14). Now this, surely, if it be possible, has the marks of being what it professes. It has the very tone of that voice which is said to speak it. And, except that voice, there is no other known among men which has ever spoken in this style. The very expression '*this* night,' which has been adduced as a mark of false time, simply proves that the view presented was already in the very eye, and at the finger's end, so to speak, of him who could so naturally point to it. On this principle, it is used *before* the tenth day, and all through it is used of the fourteenth, and the night following. And now, if, as is said, the practised ear can easily detect the various points of Elohistic and Jehovistic styles, the question is if such an ear can fail to detect here the voice of Jehovah Himself.

After this comes the portion (15–20) presenting a continuity the closest possible, while the solemn tone of verse 15 raises it quite above the level of some new document, with the former requirement of unleavened bread. To this there follows in verse 16 the first order for the double holiday—to be not now but afterwards kept—together with the special reason for the feast, "For in this day have I brought up your armies out of the land of Egypt"—a style with much more of a phonographic ring than any documentary tablet could supply. It was still some days from the extraordinary event. But that is already so real to the sight and so near, as it were, to the very touch, that the Speaker can say with all naturalness, "*In this self-same day* have I brought your armies out of the land of Egypt." It is a style unknown to subsequent document or floating tradition, but born only of present reality.

In regard to verses 18–20—ye shall eat unleavened bread—it will, of course, be urged that here at least we have the repetition from another source of the foregoing prohibition of

Passover-leaven. What, then, was the Chronicler about that he could admit all this without better reason than is thus assumed? Is it not more reasonable to refer such repetitions to the high purpose of Israel's Sovereign to insist to the utmost on this fundamental principle of the Great Feast? While at the same time opportunity is taken to extend the threatening of the death penalty to the offending stranger. If this addition, then, be made, as it seems to be, for the first time, is it in that case also to be accounted for by a subsequent document? And is it not allowable that the great Sovereign, jealous for the purity of His worship, should be pleased thus to draw tighter the fence to secure its integrity? We can thus account for all those repetitions, of which more are coming, as a great moral lesson. But we can in no way account for them as a piece of literary redundance.

Thus far, then, as to the particulars and ethical character of this communication. But more than that, we have a life-like picture of the position and action of Moses in the matter. His position is this: He receives the communication somewhere between the first and tenth of the month, with the order for a certain great arrangement on the first of those days, and an act of the greatest practical moment on the second. By the narrative, as we have it, we are shut up to the fact that Moses was on the spot. But for this it would be hard to see how it became a narrative at all. And there is in it one point of style which must be noticed. It was partly in the second person, partly in the third. "Speak to *them*, that *they* take"; "let *him* and *his neighbours* take"; "*your* lamb"; "*ye* shall take"; "ye shall keep it up"; followed by, "The whole congregation shall kill it." Now this would be the very style of communication supposed by the fact of the Hebrew leader as at once receiving and conveying the order, telling one moment what was spoken to himself, and the next how it was spoken by him to the people. There is surely a life and reality about this which none of the supposed mechanism could have put on.

Then as to the conveyance of the message to the people, it is rather assumed than asserted. The first notice of it is in verse 20, where the work of the tenth day is supposed to be over, while that of the fourteenth is now called for, but not as for the first time; for the fact of a previous announcement of this is implied both in the general order for the whole and in the omission of certain points essential now. So short, indeed, and solemn is this first prescription, as to leave the invincible impression that the full directions have already been given, and now only need to be driven home before the judgment falls. Hence, without repeating how the blood is to be put into the basin, it is simply, "Dip it *in the blood that is in* the basin." So, without its being repeated it is now assumed that *this* is the Passover night; and the present order is simply, "Let none go out of his house *until the morning.*" And so, without again repeating the order for the unleavened bread, there is the singular reference to the natural question of the children in coming times, "What mean ye by this service?" And let the tried ear judge whether this does not sound more like a voice from the very Passover time than any lines of a document, or writing out of a tradition. "Ye shall say, It is the sacrifice of the Lord's Passover, who passed over the houses of the children of Israel in Egypt when he smote the Egyptians." And how can we but admire, in this little circumstance, the confidence of Moses in Israel's future? Upon hearing which "the *people* bowed their heads and worshipped." Now it was the *elders* to whom this had been spoken; and the fact is tacitly implied that they had conveyed it to the *people.* But this is not the style of *contrivance.*

Let us notice also how little Moses is given to the needless repetitions which he or some of his authorities are charged with. For so natural had it been, were he so inclined, to repeat here the order for the besprinkling of the houses with the blood. But no, that was a thing once for all. The unleavened bread, on the other hand, so often repeated was for all ages.

One thing more, "The children of Israel went [we make no use of the 'went away'] and did as the Lord commanded Moses and Aaron." Yes, *they went*, and whither, and for what? To answer that we go back to verse 21, after well looking to its meaning. Now Moses did *certainly not say*, "Take you a *lamb* [the word is *tson*], according to your *families*." For the lamb-taking was a business not for the *family*, but the *household* (*vv.* 3, 4). And the word *tson has no such meaning as lamb.** It is *the word* in all Genesis and Exodus for *flock* or *flocks*, having no plural. Thus x. 24 and xii. 32. It is not imaginable, indeed, how the word was ever rendered otherwise here, except that the singular fact as presented was not perceived. The idea is simply, "Draw out, and take to you the flocks, according to your families, and kill the Passover." Israel is just on the point of quitting Egypt *with their flocks*. What less should they do then than have these at hand for the movement? And what less than that does Pharaoh recognise when he says, "Take your flocks and herds, as ye have said, and be gone." He meant them to go now—to go with their flocks; and meaning this he knew, of course, after all the old restrictions he had put on their liberty, that now, in spite of him, the *flocks had been drawn in*. What a scene! And Moses behind it all, conveying Jehovah's order, 'Draw out your flocks, and kill the Passover.' It is the most singular movement ever known—fit issue of those stupendous judgments—and told, in the plainest of language, by one who saw and believed it too surely to use any exclamations about it. And yet, if Moses was not actually there, as directing the whole, it turns out to be the most enormous and ridiculous of fabrications. The thought is intolerable, and there is no middle course left us. Moses *did* say, "Draw out to yourselves the flocks"; but this he could say only on the supposition that

* In the later books the word points in a few cases to *sheep*, when taken with *numerals*. Thus Isaiah vii. 21, "Two of the flock," *i.e.* two sheep. 1 Sam. xxv. 18, "Five of the flock," *i.e.* five sheep.

the circumstances were as related; for these alone provide the platform for this most peculiar order. And need it be repeated that such a relation as this was impossible, except by an eye-witness, that is to say, except by Moses?

So now, without returning to that, and in a few lines exactly suited to the lightning-like judgment of the night, but extremely ill-suited to any fiction about it, the great catastrophe is told. The firstborn are slain, as announced—Egypt's firstborn—as the retribution for the treatment of Israel, Jehovah's firstborn; and the land resounds through that gloomy night with a cry such as never before had gone up from it. So now the broken-down king calls on the Hebrews to get away, not forgetting to add the pitiful request, "And bless me also." Equally urgent are the Egyptians in begging for Israel's departure, freely giving of their silver, and gold, and jewels, and raiment, as a cheap price for such a boon, "For, say they, we be all dead men."

A word in regard to one of the principal points in the Passover—*the unleavened bread.* For here is an incongruity, it is said, Leavened bread is first made impossible by the prohibition of it, while yet the haste of the departure is made the reason for its not being prepared. Now, between these two views there is no antagonism. For (1) unleavened bread with bitter herbs served as a fit memorial of the distasteful Egyptian life; while the same, as indicative of the hasty departure, always brought up the view of Pharaoh, after his prolonged resistance, at last urging the instant departure of the people. And (2) it is not the case that they intended to leaven their bread, and were only prevented by want of time; *for they had already packed away their kneading bowls among their garments,* before their departure was so unexpectedly hastened.

In the next section (37–42) we get some short historical notices.

(1) The first of these is a statement of the route now taken by the people, and their number; and that as by one who

knew well what he was writing. "The children of Israel journeyed from Rameses to Succoth." Thus is brought out what had been implied already, that the people had been assembled at a common rendezvous. Nor is it out of place to take into account here the discipline for such a march as the people had acquired by their strict subjection to the authority of the large body of their taskmasters and officers; while it cannot be doubted that a strict discipline had been pressed to the utmost on such a multitude in the truly imperial business of brick-making. And if Moses ever was the successful general that tradition makes him, he would be at home in this new leadership.

And the number was "about 600,000 men." No census had yet been taken; and there is no antedating of the numbers by anticipation. The precise number is not known, *and is not pretended.* Enough that this was "about" it, as was soon amply verified. But it is surely very like truth and honesty that this calculation is given as suiting the moment of the exodus. And so carefully had the reckoning been kept both by the Egyptian rulers and Hebrew officers, that it could be safely set down thus. And this furnishes an important fact, as to the very systematic character of the past administration. Observe too, that in "the flocks and herds" that are next mentioned (*v.* 38) we have the very *tson* that we met with at verse 21. Nor let us omit to notice the calm decision of the statement which brings out a fact so stupendous, "About 600,000 men, besides children, with flocks, and herds, very much cattle."

(2) Now it was that bread would be wanted, and here (*v.* 39) is the notice of it: "They baked unleavened cakes of the dough which they brought with them out of Egypt," etc. It is only needful to ask whether this has the appearance of any but a contemporaneous statement.

(3) There follows this a note of extreme exactness, presenting either a very striking acquaintance with a remarkable fact, or

a very contemptible pretence to it. If it be true, it means much as to the condition and habits of the Hebrew mind. If it be only an empty parade of knowledge, it is a singular contrast to the soberness and exactness of the other statements. For the intimation is no less than this: "It came to pass at the end of the 430 years (of their sojourn in Egypt), even the (this) self-same day, it came to pass that all the hosts of Jehovah went out from the land of Egypt." It is extremely unlike any mere ordinary history, and as unlike anything that is not history.

(4) We get next (43–49) a short supplement about the Passover, with especial reference to servants and strangers. And this was the place for publishing it, whether as given before, or now for the first time, as rather appears. For it was essential to state *who* were to join in the feast, and to state it at once so as to obviate any wrong precedent.

Should any one now draw objection to the unity of the narrative from the short but well put reference in verses 50, 51, to what precedes, he must be in possession of some canon of Scripture composition more arbitrary than reasonable. For while the short paragraph has all the tone of a summary of what has just been told, it has not the most distant look of either document or tradition. One cannot but wonder indeed how it served anyone's purpose to ransack fresh documents for anything of the sort. "Thus did all the children of Israel; as the Lord commanded Moses and Aaron, so did they." It was surely worth telling that, in such a host, there was no exception as to persons; and that, amid such a variety of work, there was none as to execution. And it was well worth stamping that other fact with a sharp repetition: "It came to pass the self-same day that Jehovah brought the children of Israel out of Egypt by their armies."

If now anything be distinctly held out in this chapter, it is that the Passover celebration and the Feast of Unleavened

Bread on the 14th and 15th of the month were integral parts of one ordinance of the same date. So they are combined in all subsequent notices; so they were known to our Lord and St. Paul; and so they continue united among the Jews till this day. But it is now pronounced that this combination of the two is a mistake. "The Passover, though followed by the Feast of Mazzoth, is distinct from it both in its origin and observance." (Canon Driver, *in loc.*)

This distinction between the two supposed authors of the two portions, *i.e.* P and J E in chapter xii., is, we are told, "sufficiently established on literary grounds, but a material justification is found in the fact that verse 21 cannot be the sequel of verse 20 (or rather of 13)." But why cannot 21 be the sequel of 20? Why might not Moses, just after the order for the Mazzoth, speak that word which, by another order, so very extraordinary, brings him so strikingly into the very heart of the scene: "Draw out, and *take to you your flocks*, and *kill the Passover?*" Had only the matter been thus apprehended, it *might* (may we venture to think?) have precluded this style of criticism. Now, however, after we thought we had got a good narrative of facts, and a certain revelation from heaven, it turns out that we have got neither. Thus a great leader of modern thought by a few strokes of his pen abolishes all that, in a passage too long for citing. (*Ency. Brit. Pentateuch*, p. 511.) Wellhausen says, "It is simply an old Easter feast, and the Jehovist tradition in Exodus clearly exhibits this." "The feast is older than the Exodus." "In the priestly code (? Leviticus xxiii.) the general character of the feasts, with their true significance, is entirely changed." "They no longer rest on the seasons and their fruits, and have indeed no basis in the nature of things. They are simply statutory ordinances, resting on a positive Divine command, which at most was issued in commemoration of some historical event. The offerings are now a mere tax, which is holy only in name. This degeneration is carried farthest in case of

the Passover. An historical reason is assigned to it as early as Deuteronomy, and the Deuteronomic redaction of the Jehovist."

In the same style Professor W. R. Smith (*ibid.* p. 343) says, "The Passover is now viewed specially as a commemoration of the Exodus, and its name came to be explained from Jehovah 'passing over' the Israelites, when He smote Egypt. That this was the original meaning is by no means clear, there is no certain occurrence of the name before Deuteronomy, and the corresponding verb denotes some kind of religious performance, apparently a dance." Now, before proceeding, these extraordinary views seem to demand another word. (1) As to the *season,* it was the 14th of Abib for both Passover and Mazzoth; the course of the months having been altered, in this very view. On that 14th night "ye shall eat it in haste, it is the Lord's Passover"; the *first day* of unleavened bread being reckoned from the 15th, and this feast going on for seven days, all this being a standing yearly ordinance. (*vv.* 8, 14, 15.) (2) As to "the nature of things," which the critic brings in, it was the most expressive memorial of Israel's redemption, when all around were cut off; the unleavened bread and bitter herbs being designed to express other features in the scene.

Now this is the one view ever given of the Passover from Exodus to Deuteronomy, and no other ever would or could have been thought of, except for meeting the extraordinary theory of P and J. That theory was thought to shatter the unity of Exodus here as throughout. And now it seems that if anything could shatter that, it is just this. In the same line of statement would come in the view given in chapter xiii., where the *Mazzoth* is expressly connected with the sacrifice or redemption of the first-born, as a permanent memorial of the Passover deliverance.

If now we look to the full view of the feasts in Leviticus xxiii., we find that much is told, and more is suggested. As

to the former, the season is the same, and the same the connection with *Mazzoth.* And the thing suggested (speaking of 'the nature of things,' which the Hebrews well understood) is this: The life redeemed by the Passover blood had to be nourished. And this calls for the immediate provision of the harvest bread. Hence, on the morning of the 16th, there is presented to the Lord a sheaf of the first-ripe fruit, in token of its being His property, and His bestowment, after which the people may reap their harvest. Of this the sheaf is, of course, both pledge and earnest. Seven weeks now pass, and the harvest is gathered, the pledge redeemed, and the earnest filled up. A new feast proclaims it all, and calls for a special presentation of the new harvest loaves in testimony of gratitude for the full blessing. Such we venture to give as belonging to "the nature of things" in the connection of the feasts.

VII. The Sequel to the Exodus.

Chapter xiii.

vv. 1–16. Here is a passage much attacked, as out of place from its dislocation, and useless repetition. A little quiet reflection may give us a different view.

As will be seen, then, the passage deals with two matters; the first in *vv.* 1, 2 and 11–16; the second in 3–10. Now there does seem, at first, some abruptness here. But let the matter be closely scanned—"The Lord spake to Moses and Aaron, saying, Sanctify to me all the first-born, it is mine." Here was a fundamental law for the covenant-people; and what had just taken place was the one ground of it. Jehovah having, by the Passover blood, redeemed these first-born, now proclaims His peculiar right to them all. It was an essential feature this in the standing of the nation; and the distinction so put upon the first-born was an indestructible monument of the great redemption. To say nothing of its being the symbol of a greater

(1 Peter i. 18)—enough that the present communication is now made to Moses. And see how he conveys it to the people. He simply puts forward the great fact of the Passover, as what, at first, won the life, and now calls for the consecration, of the first-born :—the design being that the memory of that fact be perpetuated by the easy and impressive ordinance of the unleavened bread. No two things could be more thoroughly in unison than these two resultants of the Passover. Hence it was fit that the act which had secured both should be indelibly stamped on the nation's mind. There would thus be brought home to its very senses both the bitterness of the bondage and the grandeur of the emancipation, with the joyful sound ringing in their ears—'Oh Israel, thou art Pharaoh's no more, but Jehovah's only.' Hence, in terms which may stumble criticism, but must have struck deep into the nation's heart, Moses once more, but not for the last time, repeats the story of the Passover Bread, as that which so largely embodied the Passover truth. Let this, then, suffice to bring out the living link between the two portions here, which it has become the practice to hold up as so entirely disjointed.

But besides this we find here other signs of reality, and signs enough to satisfy both a sound criticism and a genuine æstheticism, that we are now in contact with a living Moses, not a dead document. What we have before us is the very leader of the Exodus, face to face with his beloved people. It is easy, of course, to say that Moses is only *said* to have thus spoken; while yet it was not Moses at all, but some one else who, for some unknown end, and at some unknown time or place, chose thus to use his name. Now when men try to personate the dead in a style like this, they run enormous risk of betraying themselves. In this case we can see the living Moses looking into the very faces, and talking into the very ears, of the living people—acting as only *he* could have done, *on the spot*, and *at the time*. "Remember" (says he) "*this day*, when ye came out from Egypt." Thus he can speak of the day (xii.

12, 14), now so close at hand, as if actually in progress—pointing to it with his finger, and saying, *This day.* And see how the style continues, "By strength of hand the Lord brought you *from this place;*" *for they are in Egypt still;* "*This day* came ye out in the month Abib." This, if not the language upon an anniversary, belongs only to the actual time. So, speaking of the future (*v.* 5), "Thou shalt keep *this* service in *this* month;" that is, the service now in progress in the month now running. But see the change when the *future* is looked at in its *own light*, "Thou shalt show thy son *in that day.*" (*v.* 8.) But *v.* 10, "Thou shalt keep *this* ordinance." For, however the day would change, the ordinance was the same. Does this look, then, as if all were alike past when this account was written—both the 'this day' and 'that day'—both the order to tell, as if by a living Moses, and the actual telling, by posterity, of "*what the Lord did to me when I came out of the land of Egypt?*" (*v.* 8.) And then he goes on—"*It*" (that is, this very feast) "shall be for a sign on thine hand, and a memorial between thine eyes, that the Lord's law may be in thy mouth"—the law being, first of all, that of the Passover ordinance, and the first-born consecration. And the reason to be given in that future is the same for each. "For" (speaking first of the Passover) "with a strong hand, *the Lord brought thee out of Egypt.*" (*v.* 9.) And then of the other—"When thy son shall ask thee in time to come (*i.e.* as to the first-born) thou shalt say, When Pharaoh would hardly let us go, then the Lord slew all the first-born in Egypt . . . therefore I sacrifice to Him all my first-born." We may judge now, then, whether the intimate combination of these two matters is the patchwork of a bad bookmaker, or the presentation of a living organism, as expounded by a living voice. For, surely, every line bespeaks the living Moses dealing face to face with his people. And it must be something else than true criticism that discovers here, instead of the Jewish prophet, some poor pretender to his mantle—with nothing known as to who, when, or where he was.

In coming to verses 17–22, it will be seen that there has been no hint of the Red Sea *passage*—only the wilderness—as divinely chosen for the *route*, because preferable to the nearer but more hazardous entrance by the Philistine country. Whether does this then look like an *ex post facto* statement, or like a simple note of how the matter stood at the professed date, and from the standpoint of the unfulfilled march? Or, again, was this fit material either for document or tradition—this that professes to be the reflection of Moses and the thought of God? Whether, let it be well considered, does such material betray the dead document, or the living communion? There appears indeed in this short portion the distinctive use of the names. But whether does that prove different *authorship* or different *idea*? The question is a very easy one. A moment's thought should answer it. For when we read that '*Elohim*' led them not through Philistia, and '*Elohim*' gave the reason for the same, and '*Elohim*' led them by the wilderness, we say at once, Of course, it is mere geography, and the great name 'Jehovah' would have been out of place here. While, in regard to Joseph's dying word, it was enough to quote it. On the other hand, when *v.* 21 returns to the style of *v.* 16, and tells of Jehovah as leading by the fire and the cloud, it is the full Divine majesty that is in exercise, and this it is that demands the name. Hence it is unity, not diversity, devout thought, not chance document, that is here signified. But it is melancholy in the extreme to find ardent Bible students thus laboriously wasting their time in trying to restore those imaginary patches to something of cohesion.

Part Third.

From the Leaving of Egypt to the Law-giving.

Chapters xiv.–xix.

I. The Passage of the Red Sea.

Chapter xiv.

SUFFICE it if we say enough to show that Moses simply tells what came before him on the occasion. In this view, we ask, What—supposing the thing never to have been—could have given rise to our present narrative? A Lucian or a Swift, if such had been at hand, might have written a brilliant burlesque from the fable. A Sophocles or a Byron might have brought a telling tragedy out of the myth. But the story, as we have it, wanted the actual Moses to tell it, or rather to let it tell itself. Talk of the course of nature putting a negative on the event! But what course of nature has room for the narrative before our eyes of that poor bubble which the matter is supposed to amount to?

Besides this general view, there are various points which can be explained only on the ground of actual occurrence, as witnessed on the spot, and related at or about the time.

(1) After the full assurance of Divine guidance, by means of the double pillar, there is the extraordinary fact of the actual exposition in geographical terms of the *route* to be taken, with the Divine order to encamp on a spot which would certainly be regarded by Pharaoh as a trap in which the enemy was already caught. The spot was the last that

they would have chosen, and for which nothing could be said but that Jehovah had chosen it for them, and for this very reason, that Pharaoh so regarding it, would plunge into the very snare which he was regarding as ruin to them.

(2) The information as said (*v.* 5) to be given to the king, with his thoughts and purpose, was not a matter for either document or tradition.

(3) The Egyptian armament is no mean confirmation (however indirect) of the account as to the number pursued.

(4) Verses 11, 12: "Because there were no graves in Egypt," &c. Now it served no sort of purpose to coin such speeches if not actually spoken. As a mere story it would have been better without them. But, as the case stands, we can actually *see* Moses in the heart of the scene. Into document or tradition we cannot see at all.

(5) The calm confidence of Moses, verses 13, 14 ("Fear ye not, stand still, and see the salvation of God," &c.), so exactly meets the need as to be the best guarantee for the truth of the account.

(6) And yet even he, it seems, (*v.* 15) has been at one time moved off his balance. He has been exhibiting, if not to man, yet clearly to God, a certain amount of unwarrantable anxiety. He has been actually praying too much—praying when the time was past for that, and action only was wanted. "Wherefore criest thou unto Me? Speak to the children of Israel that they go forward!" Who then in after times learned this from a document, or imagined it, and wrote it? Who, on any known principles of thought, would so have gone out of his way to pen a sentence so ill-assorted but for its deep truthfulness?

We add only a word about the exquisite narrative which details the end. It is this. Common pictures may be made out of anything, made anywhere, and at any time. Photographs only by the sunlight, and in face of the object. Now

here is a photograph. The closing words allow of no other view—"*Israel saw the Egyptians dead upon the sea-shore.*"

And after the photograph comes the phonogram in chapter xv. Nor is it less than *Moses' song.* Such poetry is made only at the time; and the music of it is no less than the shout of a nation's triumph. Nor was it by this one utterance that the shout was stilled. Forty years afterwards Moses was keeping it up, and telling the people that *their eyes had seen* these wonders. (Deut. xi. 2–4.) Before that generation had passed away, Joshua was repeating the same. (Joshua xxiv. 6, 7.) Even Rahab had caught up the report as the note of her own redemption, and the death-knell of her people's hopes. (Joshua ii. 9–11.) Down to Nehemiah and the Apostolic time, there was still no greater lesson for faith than this Red Sea passage. (Neh. ix. 9–12; Heb. xi. 29.) It had inspired the heart of prophets and psalmists with an unwonted ecstasy (Isa. li. 9–11; Psalm lxxiv. 13; lxxvii. 11–26), and the song of Moses still served as a key-note for the Apocalyptic singers by the sea of glass. (Rev. xv. 3.) And yet there are men who profess to lead this age in Scripture exposition—yes, and find acceptance too—who can actually write the history of Israel, and either ignore this story of the Red Sea, or reduce it to a shadow which would put contempt on the grandiloquence of Moses and Joshua, and all their uncritical imitators.

Looking back on the song, let us see how it is treated by the "critics." One of them, indeed, says that in *vv.* 1–3 "We seem to hear Moses himself speak, while the rest is probably a later expression of that; perhaps originally designed as a festal passover song." (Driver, *p.* 27.) Hence we have *no song of Moses at all*—only this introduction to one.

The chief objection seems to be that *v.* 13, "Thou hast guided," &c., "appears clearly to refer to a past event." But is it so? Is it not notoriously the Hebrew prophetic style to picture the *future* as *done?* And what right have we to strain the *prep.* (ēl) to the full sense of '*unto*,' when it can

perfectly mean 'towards,' 'on the road to'? The first meaning given by Gesenius is "*To tend, or verge to, or towards a place,* whether one reaches and enters that place or not." Nothing, then, was more true, in this sense of the word, "Thou hast guided them towards Thy holy habitation." Once beyond the Red Sea, they were well on the road to Canaan.

What follows the song is, unhappily, still as natural. The people, who had been so elated by the triumphal march, are as much depressed by the want of water which immediately follows. (*v.* 23.) And why are such things told, except that such was true? But now, through a fresh interposition, the bitter waters being sweetened, advantage is taken of the improved feeling of the people to assure them of the benefit that obedience will always secure. (*vv.* 25, 26.) And here we see the familiar, and yet confident, style in which an assurance, formally commencing as that of Moses himself, merges into one as distinctly divine. "I will put none of these diseases upon thee, which I have brought upon the Egyptians; for I am Jehovah thy Healer." Such a style may safely be taken as unknown outside the Bible—and as thus illustrating how entirely unique the Bible communications are. No room is left in them for document or tradition, nor for anything but that direct dealing of God with Moses, and Moses with Israel, which professedly took place.

II. The Manna.

Chapter xvi.

There are various questions suggested by this which do not lie in our way; our object simply being to bring out the authenticity of the narrative as strictly Mosaic. In regard, however, to the question of a purely daily supply for all, we are at liberty, without trenching in the least upon the integrity of the narrative, to consider that as depending on daily need.

For in such a region there would be various occasional means of natural supply, whether from the land or the water,* from friendly purchase, or successful battle, as in the spoiling of the Amalekites (chap. xvii.). Nor is it the design of a narrative like this to ignore such facts. And if the manna was absolutely stopped, when no longer wanted, it is but fair to conclude that the supply had already been regulated by necessity. As to the question what the manna really was, we can only only say that the account of it as a supernatural bestowment is as truth-like as could be—this account being in the most express manner guaranteed by our Lord Himself. But if the heaven-sent food was only the produce of some wilderness shrub, then nothing could have been more mean and worthless than the account as it now stands.

As to the points which serve to show the place of the writer *in the scene*, they are such as these: (1) The mention of one month, as now gone since the Exodus, shows a minute acquaintance with the facts, and allows reasonable time for all that has happened. (2) The speedy relapse of the people into their unhappy murmurings, with the quotation of their very words (*vv.* 2, 3), is not a thing the writer can be supposed to have feigned or imagined. (3) God's answer as given to Moses (*v.* 4) has all the character of the *Divine.* (4) The communication of this to the people by *Moses and Aaron* has the same tone of truthfulness. It is against *them* that the murmuring has been uttered, but Jehovah has taken it up as aimed at *Himself;* and now *in the morning* the murmurers shall see *His* glory. (*vv.* 6, 7.) Wonderful truly, if such a word was never spoken, or, if spoken, is not now truly reported as being so, but is only copied out of some imaginary document, or handed down by some impalpable tradition! (5) Very significant is the position here ascribed to the two leaders respectively. They are plainly

* Thus we can hardly deny a present application to the "hunting of beast or fowl," in Lev. xvii. 13. For other sources of supply see chap. xvii. 13; xviii. 14; xxxii. 6; Deut. ii. 6.

holding such a place *in common* as has led to the murmuring against both. (*v.* 2.) Now it is to *Moses* that the Lord gives the answer to this, and *he* takes Aaron with him in delivering it to the people. (*v.* 6.) He sends Aaron alone with a second message (*v.* 9), which is delivered accordingly (*v.* 10), and during which "the whole congregation looked to the wilderness, and behold! the glory of the Lord appeared in the cloud." (*v.* 10). Is this, then, to be regarded as a pure romance, or an extract from a document very long afterwards? The first idea is certainly the worse, *religiously* considered; the second, we think, if taken *critically*. But to proceed. Jehovah now deals with Moses, and Moses with the people (11–32); but Moses, when expedient (as in 33, 34), employs Aaron to act. Now it is easy to understand how one, in making up a story or a play, would thus shift about his *dramatis personæ*, for variety's sake. But it is difficult to imagine our present writer as following such a style, except just because *such were the facts;* and it is difficult also, if not more, to imagine any but our Moses as so knowing the facts. (6) As to the chronology implied in verses 34, 35, about the laying up of the manna, there need be no difficulty; for at the very worst we can freely admit, if necessary, the addition of such notices by a competent hand. And yet why may not that hand have been Moses' own, even on the most reasonable supposition that his custom was to *write in the book* (xvii. 14) from time to time what he wished to record?

And yet, though all seems to hang so well together, the objections to unity are many. For the composers of it seem to be no fewer than three, E, J, P, while the various dislocations are painful. One of the objections is that there are 'differences of manifestation' requiring these varied sources. For the one is of 'flesh' in the 'evening,' while the other speaks only of 'bread' in the 'morning.' But surely it is not needful, nor the least in the scriptural style, to say *all* at *all times*. Nor does *addition* mean *divergence*. The next objection seems more

serious, and yet only needs to be looked at from a broader standpoint than the hard and narrow critical one. It is this, that the command to tell the people about the evening flesh and the morning bread in verses 11, 12, follows the actual delivery of the message in 6–8. Now take the matter naturally. The people have complained of the want of flesh (*v.* 3); the Lord has told Moses how He will meet the want. It is not unnatural, then, that Moses should intimate the general fact to the people of both the 'flesh' and the 'bread.' But first they must have a sight of the glory of the Lord (*v.* 7), which takes place in verse 10. And then, *after this*, Moses is formally commissioned to deliver the message about the supply. Who will venture to say, then, that he may not have been informed of this at the first? or that he certainly would not give any hint of it till expressly ordered? And yet it is in the ignoring of such simple considerations that so many objections to the unity of the narrative are based. It is this continual tendency to set aside the *natural* and *practical*—or, in other words, *the thing which would take place*—and to set up instead the *naked, verbal, and critical.*

One thought more—about the manna. Not only did Moses believe in it, from first to last, as a solid, supernatural fact, and Joshua, and the psalmists, and Nehemiah, and the whole body of Jews till Christ's day, but Christ Himself as thoroughly and heartily as any of them. And more than that, He once chose it as the basis of a very special discourse about Himself, "The Bread of Life." Yes, and when He had already before Him as perfect a ground for such a discourse as any disciple could have imagined, in the miraculous bread which He had just been making, still He was satisfied to use that as merely a step to the manna, drawing out to a very unusual length His application of the Mosaic fact. Is it so, then, that my Lord believed in that literal wilderness manna, as simply and firmly as any Jew of His day, and shall I think myself justified in doubting it? I may, but not without doubting or disbelieving *Him*. It is

vain to tell me that having 'emptied Himself,' He had stooped to the ordinary—say, if you will, the very highest—Jewish level in such matters. And does that mean that He stooped to believe what was *not true*, and to declare as fact what never happened? Does it mean that He parted with His own eyesight, perfect as that must have been in all that He undertook to teach, and that He was content to use, for an occasion like this, what may be called a good average national eyesight? If so, then I no longer know how to follow my Lord as THE LIGHT OF THE WORLD. The conclusion is that, so long as I believe in Him, I must believe what He believed as to the wilderness manna. Or take it thus: Exodus states, in unambiguous terms, that the manna was a supernatural gift from Jehovah, as not yet incarnate. But this was a mistake! and as a mistake it became a fond Jewish tradition, put, like the rest of them, in the place of God's truth, and entirely misrepresenting Him. Jehovah at last became incarnate, and finding the tradition current, He accepted, sealed it, and built upon it some of His most important teaching. As for tradition in general He rose above it all, and indignantly scathed it with the breath of His mouth. In this case, and any others as referring to the doings of the now incarnate Jehovah, He took them to His bosom as readily as any Pharisee. It was reserved for Christians in these days to find that the Pharisee crowd was mistaken, and our Lord with them. And such is the new Christ offered us as the great Prophet and Head of a re-united Christendom!

III. Rephidim.

Chapter xvii.

Massah and Meribah. (1–7.) To see the traits of life and truth here we only need to weigh each sentence.

(1) The people move on till they reach Rephidim, when the alarming news goes out, *No water.* (*v.* 1.)

(2) Instead of devoutly calling to God, as experience might now have taught them, they angrily appeal to Moses, who firmly answers, "Why chide ye with me? Why tempt ye Jehovah?" (*v.* 2.)

(3) The murmuring becomes bitterer, as if Moses alone were responsible, and Jehovah nowhere. (*v.* 3.)

(4) Instead of being quieted by this fresh ebullition, they speak of stoning Moses, who cries to Jehovah for direction. (*v.* 4.)

(5) Jehovah directs him to go to the rock in Horeb with the elders, and his rod, engaging to stand before him, while he smites the rock and the water flows out. This Moses does. (*vv.* 5, 6.)

(6) A memorial name is at once attached to the place, *Massah* and *Meribah*, Temptation and Strife. (*v.* 7.) The impious question had been, Is Jehovah among us or not? This is the answer, Jehovah's appearance and the gushing water.

Now what could be a more worthy style of action toward such a people? And what a more profitable lesson for all? It is here that these Mosaic narratives are immeasurably removed from all legend.

Amalek.

Chapter xvii. 8–16.

"Then came Amalek, and fought with Israel in Rephidim." (*v.* 8.) It was more than those sons of Esau could bear, to see Israel thus triumphant over Pharaoh. But Moses is ready for them, and says to Joshua, "Choose us out men, and go, fight with Amalek; to-morrow I will stand on the top of the hill with the rod of God in my hand." (*v.* 9.) So, while Joshua takes his soldiers to the field Moses goes up the hill with Aaron and Hur. (*v.* 10.) And as the business of Joshua is to fight, so that of Moses, with his two friends is, in one form or other,

to intercede for the fighters. This is signified by the moving to the higher ground, and lifting up towards heaven the rod of victory. The holding up of this will be the symbol and assurance of success; the letting it down the token of defeat. Hence the fortune of the battle alternates according to the power in Moses' hands; and to supply them with this Aaron and Hur hold them up. This goes on till sunset, the issue being that "Joshua and his people discomfited Amalek with the edge of the sword." Very important must this have been, both morally and materially. For thus Israel saw both where their strength lay, and how, by waiting on Jehovah, they could conquer the strongest and richest enemy. Amalek had smitten some stragglers in the rear (Deut. xxv. 18); but, before the sword of Joshua and the prayers of Moses, his armour and tents must all go down. To unbelief this is all, of course, a legend. To faith it is a fact, and a grand object-lesson which has well served its purpose for both Hebrew and Christian. And even to reason it is a fact; for reason has never yet been called to deal with legend of such a character, and told in such a style.

Nor has it been the custom to tell when and how legends spring up—if, indeed, that be known—and still less to follow them up from their inception, with the recording pen. And yet here (*v.* 14), "Jehovah said to Moses, Write this for a memorial *in the book.*" (Hebrew.) Thus Moses, it seems, has a record book which he is in the habit of using for important events, and which he is specially required to use now, even though he has to "rehearse it in the ears of Joshua." And such a case can prove no less than a principle and a custom.

So Moses built an altar, and called the name of it *Jehovah-Nissi.* It could be no trifling event—and certainly far from legend-like—that was thus signalised by monumental altar, as well as written memorial. And not only so, but the reason is given as for a very substantial matter—"Because Amalek's

hand is against the throne of Jehovah (R.V.), therefore Jehovah will have war on Amalek from generation to generation." To modern ears the voice may be unpleasant. The question is whether the word is human or Divine?

IV. Jethro's Visit.

Chapter xviii.

Every line here is of importance—instinct, as it is, with the life of solid fact, or honest sentiment. If such evidence of a true autobiography be refused, we know not how to argue it. Little fit, indeed, for the hands of document, or the mouth of tradition, was most of the material here, but most fit for narration by an eye-witness and actor. In the one view, we do not know what to make of the notes about Zipporah. In the other, we gladly welcome them. So father-in-law and son-in-law meet here, and talk just as they should, and invite us to join them. In such a field of patent truth it is hard to particularise. But there is a word in *v.* 11 which seems to stand out with a prominence of its own. "*Now* I know," says Jethro—I did not always know it as I now do—much as I had both heard and believed. But "now I know that Jehovah is greater than *all the* gods." Did this, then, come by *document*, or *tradition*, or how? So Jethro offers his sacrifice to *ha-Elohim* (*the* Elohim), and entertains Aaron and the elders. Then, next day, seeing Moses at his ordinary work, he enquires into it, when Moses states in reply that he "makes them hear the statutes of God (ha-Elohim) and His laws." (*v.* 16.) This, Jethro allows, is good, but the labour is excessive, and must be shared. So—according to our A.V.—he says, "Thou shalt teach them ordinances and laws" (*v.* 20)—as if meaning, "Rather do something different from now." Whereas the meaning is, as in R.V.—Go on, and "teach them (as well) *the* ordinances and *the* laws." Jethro is not guilty of the blunder

of exhorting Moses to teach *laws in general*. What the *special* laws pointed to were we cannot say. That makes the specialty all the more notable. Just one point more. "If thou do this, *and God command thee so*." Jethro is humble and cautious. The question is, How did these delicate traits of such a character get abroad? But we must not linger where all deserves to be noted. Enough now to point out the exactness in the use of the Divine names. See then how, in ordinary cases, Jethro thinks and speaks of Elohim, while yet even he cannot refrain from ascribing to *Jehovah*—of whom he has heard so much—the deliverance from Egypt. In *v.* 5 he keeps, of course, to the ordinary term, 'Mount of God.' (as in chap. iii. 1.) At *v.* 8 Moses can speak only of *Jehovah*, and Jethro, following the same line of thought, heartily employs the same language. (*vv.* 9–11.) When Jethro brings his sacrifice it is, of course, to God—and yet it is to *ha-Elohim*, who is "*above all the gods*." Moses tells his father-in-law that the people come to him to enquire of Elohim (*v.* 15), and that he instructs them in the statutes of *Elohim*. He has not as yet any special instructions from Jehovah for them, for their enquiries go no further than natural and social subjects. In the same terms, and for the same reasons, Jethro freely proceeds to the end. (*vv.* 19, 21, 23.) The whole gives a perfect opportunity of testing the usage of the names. And so we find that, wherever *Elohim* is sufficient, it is used. But where the great redemption comes in, Jethro, as much as Moses, must speak of Jehovah. To split up the chapter between various authors and seasons, for such a reason as this, is a new thing in criticism and literature. In a word, there is no sign here of double authorship, only of double idea or view.

V. The Preparation for the Law-giving.

Chapter xix.

We now come to Sinai and its revelations.

Before proceeding, we may notice how the 'critical' method treats this chapter. The original sources are E and J. Why there is no P we cannot say. So "two parallel narratives have been combined, though *it is no longer possible to determine* the precise limits of each. Kuenen considers *vv.* 20–25 as forming 'part of a third and independent narrative.'" Meanwhile, the only thing we are sure of is, that the Compiler or Redactor has made his selection from these sources, so awkwardly as to leave dislocations and repetitions which good sense should never have permitted. The list of these stands thus—

Verse 3. The sequel to '*went up*' is not the 'came' of *v.* 7, but the 'went down' of *v.* 14.

Verse 9 is superfluous after 8. Perhaps an accidental repetition.

Verse 13 is isolated, and not explained by what follows; for 'trumpet' in *v.* 16 is not the same as this.

Verse 20 is a repetition of 18.

Verse 21 is a repetition of 12.

Verse 25. And said (not told) is not in connection with xx. 1. Chap. xx. 1 is the proper sequel to xix. 19.

Again, Aaron and the priests are introduced without preparation. [As for this we do not know what preparation is wanted besides *vv.* 22, 24. As to the other objections, they are taken up in their own place below.]

Anticipating now the conclusion to which the whole account leads, it is this, that—while, in the Sinai scene, the heavens are thundering over us, and the mountain quaking around, and all nature seems tottering to its fall—we have a rock underneath, as quiet and stable as at this moment is that same mount Sinai. That rock, if we regard it intellectually (and critically

also), is firmly compacted by truth, reason, conscience, and whatever belongs to that human psychology which entered into the Divine image stamped on man. Give us, on the other hand, modern criticism for our guide, and you have put us down on a seething ocean, with a skiff of yesterday to carry us through. Such is our conclusion in studying the whole. Let us see how it is borne out.

First, come the very special preparations for one of the foremost days in the world's history. For real greatness it can stand only with events like Creation, the Flood, the Passover. Nor was there as great a day again till the day of Bethlehem. It is the day of the proclamation from Sinai of the Law with its two tables of love for the heart, and its ten precepts for the life—a matter which concerns us equally with Israel, as lying at the root of all morality, religion, and redemption. How this was regarded by every saint and prophet till our Lord came we know well. And we know too how He regarded it, and how He accepted the very page before us as the production of Moses, with a true view of the Jehovah communications between man and God. And being sure that He, "the Word made flesh," while continuing "in the Father," must have been the best possible judge here, as everywhere, it would require not only a new criticism, but a new humanity, to move us from our confidence in the integrity of the present Mosaic account. We now inquire, as before, into the *internal* grounds for this confidence; while so many, we know, are at the very same time meeting the account with their *à priori* objections to its subject matter, drawn from its visible, audible, palpable features. That is to say, they refuse to accept the transaction as real, because of its decisive anthropomorphism. Others again recognise in this the best vehicle for the conveyance of the thoughts of God to the mind of man. And further than that, we may venture to think that, but for the Divine reality of the transaction, it was utterly beyond the power of any Moses to have saved his picture from overwhelming ridicule.

Now for the arrangements. It was in the third month after leaving Egypt, and on the same day of the month, that is, the fourteenth day of the third month of the year, that the people 'encamped before the mount.' Such minuteness of detail has its real value. And, without further introduction, "Moses (we read) went up unto *God*." Yes, he went away from among *men*. Some Divine impulse had certainly moved him to that; and "*Jehovah* called to him out of the mountain." And the call first points to facts patent to all Israel, and of which they are now to be reminded—"Thus shalt thou say to them, Ye have seen what I did to the Egyptians, and how I bore you on eagle's wings, and brought you to Myself." But now if the passage of the Red Sea was no more than 'criticism' loves to make it, such language should have exposed any common speaker, to how little of respect we will not say. And yet He who thus begins goes on, as the Sovereign and Proprietor of Israel, "Now, therefore, if ye will obey My voice indeed, and keep My covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto Me above all people; for all the earth is mine; and ye shall be to me a kingdom of priests, and a holy nation." That is all, and Moses is to convey it to the people. But if Moses, or some other, wove that out of his 'inner consciousness,' he is worthy of an admiration beyond what he has perhaps ever yet received.

This then Moses was to speak to the people. So he came and called for the elders, 'and *laid before their faces* all these words.' Can this 'laying' before the *face* possibly mean anything more than speaking into their *ears?* Be that as it may, it is plain that there has been something more than a mere report to the elders. There has clearly been some gathering and informing of *the people*, for the result is that *all the people answered together, saying, All that the Lord hath spoken will we do.* "*And Moses returned the words of the people* to the Lord." And thus, according to the proper meaning of the words, *he made a second ascent.* So now he is informed of the altered mode of Divine communication that is

to be employed, "Lo, I come to thee in a thick cloud, that the people may hear when I speak with thee (*in* or *through* thee as their mediator), and believe thee for ever."

In what follows there is a difficulty. It lies in the sentence, "And Moses told (showed, exposed) the words of the people to Jehovah": and that, while there has been no mention either of his coming from the mount with the message, or returning to it with the answer. Now we could not much object, if any one should—in the present state of the Hebrew text—suppose, with the new criticism, that without any new double movement, these words were a repetition from the *very similar* expression "returned the words," in the previous verse. But we greatly prefer the simpler view by which the words would mean, that Moses having returned to the Lord, put before Him the people's answer to this. For what but that was there to report? It would be needful of course to suppose that he had come down and gone up again, and that, a third time. But such a movement is not too much for our assuming, if the words really involve it, as we plead that they do.

Being now on the mount, then, Moses gets a new charge (*vv.* 10–13): "Jehovah said to him, Go to the people, and sanctify them to-day and to-morrow, and let them wash their clothes, and be ready against the third day: for the third day the Lord will come down in the sight of all the people on Mount Sinai." Further explanation is not given, for that would only have required to be itself explained. Meanwhile Moses is ordered to fence the mount round, and command the people, under penalty of death, to keep away from it, and not even touch its border. Only "when the trumpet soundeth long, then they shall come up to the mount."

Moses now goes down, sanctifies the people, and prepares them for their advance on the third day. (14, 15.) And then we read (16, 17), "It came to pass in the morning, that there were thunders and lightnings, and a thick cloud upon the mount, and the voice of the trumpet exceeding loud; so

that all the people that was in the camp trembled. And Moses brought forth the people out of the camp to meet with God; and they stood at the nether part (let us read, *on the lower part of the mount*—the very mount that they were to go up, at a certain time—not below it, *but at its lowest part*). And now the mount was covered with smoke, as of a furnace, while Jehovah came upon it in fire, "and it quaked greatly." And as the trumpet blast continued long, and waxed louder, Moses spake—we are not told what—and God answered. Thus Jehovah came down on the top of Sinai, calling Moses to meet Him there—when He sends him down with a charge to the people against their breaking through the fence; while even to the favoured priests is sent a special charge to "sanctify themselves." Moses, upon this, strangely takes it upon himself to argue that, after all the precautions already employed, there is not the danger pre-supposed by this charge. The result is that the charge is renewed, and, as regards the priests, is even made more stringent. "So Moses went down to the people and told them."

What the next position of Moses was is not quite clear. For, simultaneously with the charge just executed, he had received the order to ascend the mount with Aaron. (*v.* 24.) Now this new ascent may have been made previous to the descent, or it may have followed it before the law-giving, so as to allow him to return, and take his place with his people during that, as we must suppose that he did. And it is here we find him at the close of the law-giving (xx. 19), as the place fittest for mediator and instructor.

Such is the account of the preparations for the law-giving. And instead of having any difficulty as to the reality of the facts, our conviction is that except for that they had never been told at all. For we cannot even imagine a reason for Moses making up any of them. Take one of the principal features in the scene, the frequent change in his position, as up on the mount with God, or down with the people. And if

it be difficult to tell why there was so much of this, the difficulty itself is an argument for its truth. For we can conceive of its being so told, only as having so taken place. As to its having been made up, for the sake of effect, there is no trace of that. And this is the more evident from the fact that, instead of its being pressed upon us, we have, in some cases, to find out for ourselves what the position was.

And then mark. This moving about of Moses is as far as possible from every sort of *stage-acting*. It is all instinct with weighty moral design, for there must be in this matter a mediator between Israel and Jehovah, and Moses has all the credentials possible of being the one. Neither before nor since has anything of the sort been known in the world—Jewish or Gentile. It has nothing to be named with it but only that still grander transaction of which we know it was a shadow. But for the present the Mosaic fact stands out in all its novelty and uniqueness; and it must be got out of the way before we can get quit of that Law-giving which constituted its highest object—one of its marvels consisting in the carrying of it out. For while other religions have with their 'mysteries' had occasion for their mediators also, this mediatorship of Moses differs by a whole heaven from them all. As for all these, they are a class by themselves—the intimates of their gods—whose secrets *they* only know, being thus shut out from ordinary human fellowship, and shut in to a religiousness of their own, through which they are enabled to dole out their peculiar acquaintance with fate and futurity. Look at Moses, on the other hand, and tell, if you can, where, apart from perfect truth, the conception came from. There is not a movement towards Jehovah but it is all chronicled. There is no dealing with Him but every word of it is conveyed to the people. Important man he certainly is. But as to self-importance, and importance of a kind to aggrandise him, there is none. It is all for the sake of Israel, even when most acutely suffering for it as the victim of his very position on

their behalf. Thus it may be that Jehovah deals with him for their very life, and one of his rewards is that they are ready to stone him. Again and again, on this very mountain, he goes up to God for them, and comes down again for them—not keeping back a word as spoken *by* him or spoken *to* him. And then, after all, just as he has on their account staid so long with God and done so much, his reward is, "We wot not what has become of him—make us gods to go before us." This is the man who was raised up as mediator between God and Israel. And his sayings and doings still meet with admiration, even from those who pay little heed to him as the medium of this Sinai covenant. For that precious portion of it, now spoken of as the Priest's Code, is no product, we are told, of his mediatorship or age.

Among the many points for which there is no accounting, except that they are divinely arranged, is the very express order for the people to move towards the Divine presence, only after long and loud blowing of the trumpet. Now it is of consequence to see that this, like everything else, was entirely free from all mixture of the magical and superstitious element apparent in the prescriptions of all common religions. For, when combined with all the rest, this was clearly to prevent the rashness and irreverence against which provision is otherwise made, and to give opportunity by that overwhelming sound for the attuning of the mind to the solemn advance toward Jehovah.

There is an objection made here which we could hardly have imagined. It is that verse 13, which announces beforehand the trumpet blowing, stands entirely *isolated*, and is not to be identified with the real fact in verse 16, *because the term for trumpet is different!* As if there might not be two words for a thing so common, and as if each of the two might not be used at the different stages of the proceeding!

And such is the divine stage with its very peculiar arrangements for the proclaiming of that law for Israel and the world. It was the grandest law-giving that had ever yet been heard

of; it was something to stand while the world lasted; and hence it was only fit that it should be heralded beyond all past imagining, and the stage accords well with the event. It certainly does not outrun it, and neither does it come short of it, except as nothing in the way of stage can come up to such law-giving; and the difference is certainly incalculable between this stage on the one hand, and all stages on the other—whether in the displays of royalty, or the dreams of mythology, or the pretensions of religion. It is a difference befitting the design and result in the various cases. Alike in the ancient and the modern theatre, the ingenuity of man has been taxed to the utmost to find, by stage-craft, fit trappings for the genius of the dramatist. Here, on the other hand, is no ingenuity and no pressing—no attempt at words, though Moses could well be eloquent. But the stage starts up at once at the word which said, "Let there be light." It is Divine thought only and Divine expression that we find here. But how—let anyone tell us—would the matter have stood if, in the absence of the very facts related, Moses, or someone for him, had been merely trying his hand at the drama and stage of this chapter. One very remarkable man did once try his hand (or someone for him, though we certainly believe it was the man himself) at depicting his meeting and dealing with Deity, and Deity with *him*, and the result was Mohammed's journey in one night to the ninth heaven with the view to the setting up of a religion. And a greater burlesque was never offered to the world. Now we have before us the scene on Sinai as occupying two days in the life of Moses, and the contrast is all that is possible between falsehood and truth—between the mean idol self and the glorious Jehovah God.

It may be indeed that *we* in these days object to this sort of thing *in toto*, and think that we do well to 'criticise' it; but we should do much better if we could show how, on the known principles of human nature, the present picture, in default of truth and a Divine original, ever came into existence.

Part Fourth.

From the Law to the Tabernacle.

I. The Law.

Chapter xx.

THE LAW is now to be promulgated, but not in the way of writing or message through Moses. That will come in due course, when the supplementary statutes of the nation are delivered. Meanwhile the proclamation is for the world, and the Sovereign must speak it out with His own voice in the universal ear. For the sake of this has the stage been prepared and the multitudes gathered in. He who had said of Himself I AM THAT I AM is now going to say to us that simple word which suits *HIM* alone—THOU SHALT and Thou SHALT NOT.*

Verses 1–17. One question fairly answered here would settle much. Are these Ten Commandments the very words of God, and really spoken at Sinai? For if so, there is equal reason to

* We now easily get the answer to two of the 'critical' objections, one of them from xix. 25. The first is taken from "Moses spake," not *told*, as if there was nothing *reported* by him. But if he *spake*, he surely spake *something*, and that could only be what he was commissioned to *tell*.

Again, we are told that xx. 1 is *not* the sequel to xix. 25, but to verse 19. Now this negative is perfectly correct, in so far as "God's speaking all these words" is not the same as Moses' speaking in the previous verse. In this matter God is alone. But the reference to verse 19 is as plainly not correct; *for God's answering Moses by a voice*, during the preliminary stage, could never be the same as *His speaking to the people*, when the preliminary stage was over—and speaking the Decalogue too. This mending of the supposed dislocation is one of the extraordinary features of the new criticism.

accept as His too the other words ascribed to Him in this book. Can anyone imagine, then, that Moses, in reporting this loud voice, is only giving out the echo of a dream, or speaking his own pious notions as to the thoughts of the Eternal? Few will think so who accept the Bible at all. And yet there is the same reason for that idea here as elsewhere. If, on the other hand, we really believe that God speaks here in a voice which penetrates this great host, then it cannot be reasonable to object to the smaller matter of the traversing, by words equally real, in the more ordinary case, of that shorter passage from the divine mouth to the ear of Moses.*

Now it was a great thing to attempt to depict a transaction like this, without falling into a style grotesque or magniloquent. How, then, can we account for this very solemn and sober picture, except that the scene described was before the eyes to draw from? And there was another thing, smaller indeed, but

* One of the 'critical' views of the giving of the Law is this, "The giving of the Law at Sinai has only a formal, not to say dramatic, significance. It is the product of the poetic necessity for such a representation of the manner in which the people was constituted Jehovah's people, as should appeal directly and graphically to the imagination. Only so can we justly interpret those expressions, according to which Jehovah with His own mouth thundered the ten Commandments down from the mountain to the people below, and afterwards for forty days held a confidential conference with Moses alone on the summit. For the sake of producing a solemn and vivid impression, that is represented as having taken place in a single thrilling moment which in reality occurred slowly and almost unobserved." (WELLHAUSEN, as above, p. 399.) Compare with this what he had just said, "We cannot treat the legislative portion of the Pentateuch as a source from which our knowledge of Mosaism can be derived. If it was the work of Moses, it must have remained a dead letter for centuries." Hence we ask what it is that he is speaking of in the first quotation.

As to the *style* of J and P respectively, we can well understand why the lively scene of the Law-giving was handed over to J, but we cannot understand how the "measured, prosaic" P was equal to the equally poetic and dramatic scene as here presented of the forty days of the 'confidential conference' on the mount. The wonder is how the critics do not see that their distinctions melt away before such facts.

still too great for any Moses, without reality to work from; and that was the picture of the people as moved by it all, "All the people saw the thunderings and lightnings, and the noise of the trumpet, and the mountain smoking; and when they saw it they removed, and stood afar off." Did they see nothing then, and hear nothing of all this? Have we here no reality at all, only a romance, with as little of purpose as of truth? And is this the state of things in which they said to Moses, or, at least, are said to have said, "Speak thou with us, and we will hear; but let not God speak with us, lest we die"? And is this most uncalled-for speech of theirs the real occasion of the solemn rejoinder, "Fear not, for God is come to prove you, and that His fear may be before your faces, that ye sin not"? And then, without further explanation, in a case which would well speak for itself, "The people stood afar off." Is this a fact, and did Moses see it? "And Moses drew near to the thick darkness where God was." Mark, it is given as a material fact also that, while the people drew back from the spot where Jehovah was manifesting Himself, Moses drew nearer to it. Now, if this was not a fact, Moses knew it to be a falsehood, and what then? Yes, what but that Moses, or someone for him, had begun thus early to trample down the third of the great precepts, "Thou shalt not take the name of Jehovah thy God in vain"? The precept was given, in short, for no other purpose than to prevent all tampering with that name. And yet this is how Moses began, or is said to have begun, his very sacred mediatorship—by thus prostituting the great name, for the setting off of his own base importance! If, on the other hand, all this be true, what shall we stumble at? But if not all true, then who will find out how much? and, as matters stand, who will help us out of this confusion? And who does not admire the simplicity of the 'criticism' which thinks to pilot the age through a whirlpool like this?

But now leaving this mist, and returning to the word (22–26), we find that the immediate result of Moses' "ap-

proaching the thick darkness" is to get a supplementary revelation of the first importance, and one altogether in its place. For one design of the law was certainly to bring home sin. And, that it was now doing this, the people's behaviour amply showed. So the revelation of law calls for the revelation of mercy. And that shall not be deferred. But first, let law give one stroke more: "Ye have seen how I have talked with you from heaven. Ye shall not make with Me gods of silver, neither shall ye make with Me gods of gold." It is the first thing in religion, and the thing where Israel, like all others, was most inclined to go astray. And he that is wrong here is wrong in all. So the first step on the right road is right worship. Is there anything in this then to call for a new author with his document? Or rather, is there not something which fastens the stamp of truth on the wonders just related—something in the way of a quiet, living word closing up the loud voices which now are stilled? "*Ye have seen that I have talked with you.*" Most extraordinary of romances, if romance it be—and most extraordinary of contrivances, if it was a device to move a far distant age by a means only fabled to have been tried upon those far off progenitors who had unhappily never known anything about it!

And now, if the first step in obedience is right worship of the one Jehovah, the first need of sinners in their worship is *sacrifice* (*v.* 24). And for this there is wanted an altar, with its "burnt offerings and sacrifices." Every proclamation of duty, in short, is a proclamation of guilt. And every charge of guilt is a demand for atonement. Such is certainly the Mosaic doctrine—the *command* of duty with the *demand* for sacrifice—neither of these to preclude the other. Such are the two cardinal principles of this religion of Sinai. And if He, whose end even through Moses was redemption, and the obedience which follows that, if *He* has been pleased thus to combine His law and His grace—making law call for grace, and grace lead back to law—shall we prefer to this deep order

of His book that officious criticism which steps in, and finds here only dislocation and disorder?

The altar now called for is to be the plainest possible—earth, or rough stone. For meanwhile, there is no design to teach anything but the utmost simplicity in worship, and with simplicity, moral purity (*v.* 26), both being in direct antagonism to the worship all round about. And, as there is no present design to take up the question of locality in worship, the promise is, "In all places where I record My name will I come to thee, and bless thee." For long this continued strictly true, nor can it be affected by the prominence given at any time to a particular place. For that would be simply *one of the places* where He recorded His name. There is nothing, in short, here about the number of places, or how long any of them should continue. It was only some time after the settlement in the land that one place would be chosen for this purpose. (Deut. xii. 11.) And not till the time of David was the place chosen. (2 Samuel vii.)

Moses, as we have seen, then, in receiving these last communications, has been represented as nearer to God, and the people as further off, than when the law was delivered to all. Now it much concerns us to know what purpose it could serve to deal out romance, instead of reality, in such a matter; or how such a thing would ever have been consigned to documents. But if the fact be as here written, then we can readily understand the propriety of this position before God, of people and mediator respectively. And now it is in this place of nearness, enshrouded amid the solemn darkness, that Moses is charged with the special statutes which largely constitute the Sinai covenant.

II. The Sinai Covenant.

Chapter xxi.–xxiii.—It was a grand work that was achieved by the Decalogue. It laid the divine basis for Israel and the world, in religion and morals; and required only to be heartily

observed so as to ensure universal prosperity. But man, being what he is, something more was wanted for social order and administration. Besides which, an unprecedented thing had just taken place. The multitude of Egyptian slaves had, by one almighty stroke, been transformed into *the people* of Jehovah, and by one more had been set on the road to their own settlement in a land of their own. A code of laws then, specific and authoritative, is now wanted for their guidance there. When should this be given, if not now? And how, if not thus? Or by whom but Israel's King? and through whom but this chosen Moses? He indeed, even now, was not without some good means of guidance. He had inherited law from his fathers. He had been a diligent student of Egyptian wisdom. And he had profited by the visit of his shrewd father-in-law. But more was wanted, and with the Sinai stamp upon it. Jehovah must promulgate a special Code for His peculiar people. So, as there is no time to lose, no one to help, and little to be gained by experiment, it seems imperative that the God of Israel now give out, beyond doubt, His own mind for the social guiding of those whom He has just redeemed. And this He is said to do: "These are the judgments and the statutes which thou shalt set before them." Now mark—the *place* of this is given; it is Mount Sinai, and specially the spot where the Divine glory was being now displayed. The *time* is given; it follows close upon the promulgation of the law. And the *situation* is given; Moses having just separated from the congregation, and drawn nearer to God. Now this is not the style of tradition or romance, nor yet of document—especially when we should have to look for the original chroniclers, and the subsequent compiler, alike in the dark—there being nothing more distinct to speak of than certain capital letters which look only like algebraic symbols apart from facts. It essentially differs also from all legend of ancient laws, such, *e.g.* as Buddhistic. It is the exact contrast to all the cave revelations of Mohammed. It is in the day-

light as compared with the origin of the laws of Solon, or the "Twelve Tables." It is as certain at least as any of the words of Confucius, or laws of Alfred. And while those were only natural, this is *natural*, and *supernatural* also.

Mark again. "The words and judgments" thus spoken to Moses are declared to have been at once delivered by him to the people, their answer also being related. Characters like those have generally been accepted as the seal of truth, and deserve better treatment than to be set down as only a blind for falsehood. Nor can any prejudice against the mode of conveyance ever impair their real value. Now, after all, it is a serious thing both for human morality and mutual confidence, if the man whom we have always taken for the great legislator turns out to have no real place here, but only serves as a mask for others of whose action we know nothing. Thus we should have a work set up under a false pretence, and, in spite of the fiercest opposition from human passion, advancing to the most wonderful consummation, in virtue of that very falseness which should have strangled it in its birth. For if Moses be not true, he is nothing. Nor shall we much improve the case if, without professing to go so far, we are content to stop with, "As for this Moses, the man who is said to have stood with God on Sinai, we wot not what is become of him;" for there *seems* to be so much in what is ascribed to him of *speaking*, and there *is* so much in what we have before us as to his *acting*, that we cannot reasonably give up such a one as only a character in the dark after all.

This Code then, introduced as we have seen, Moses professes to get directly from the Divine mouth for delivery to Israel, "These are the judgments which thou shalt set before them." Is it said, But that is only the Hebrew *style*, and proves nothing as to either origin or transmission of the message? No, it is more than style; for not only does this Lawgiver say, as one speaking of Himself, "Then shall

Jehovah's oath be between them both;" "He that sacrificeth to any God, but to Jehovah only," &c. (xxii. 11–20); but He directly speaks *for* Himself, "If thou afflict them, and they cry to *Me*, *I* will hear. . . . And My wrath shall wax hot, and I will kill you with the sword." Such is not the character of an impersonal style. And even in so small a matter as the withholding of a night-covering from a poor man, "When he crieth unto Me, I will hear, for I am gracious" (*vv.* 23, 27). And in general, "Ye shall be holy unto Me, neither eat torn flesh." And so, "Keep far from a false matter, for I will not justify the wicked. And in all things that I have said to you, be circumspect, and make no mention of the name of other gods" (xxiii. 7, 13). The addition of plain matters of fact like the following—matters over which the great God alone had control—this lifts the Code into a region of its own, and should suffice to secure the devoutness of the critic, "Three times shalt thou keep a feast *to Me* in the year"—"Unleavened bread. . . . Harvest . . . Ingathering." . . . "Three times in the year shall all the males appear before Adonai Jehovah." "Thou shalt not offer the blood of *My* sacrifice with leavened bread, neither shall the fat of my sacrifice remain till the morning." "The first of the first-fruits of the land shalt thou bring into the house of Jehovah thy God" (xxiii. 14–19). Now He who is just on the point of commanding the house (xxv. 8) may surely be allowed to *anticipate* as much as this.

This is now followed by a peculiar prescription which calls for remark—"Ye shall not seethe a kid in its mother's milk." To see the meaning and importance of this, we have only to know that it was one of the most intensely idolatrous and ensnaring of the heathen practices of the time. Hence the thrice repeated prohibition (chap. xxxiv. 26; Deut. xiv. 21), and always in the same connection, is by no means excessive. "The ancient idolaters were wont," says Abarbanel, "when they gathered the fruits of the earth, to seethe a kid in its mother's

milk, that their gods might be propitious to them." He names no authority. But Dr. Cudworth found it in a Caraite writer, who says, "All the trees and fields and gardens were sprinkled with the broth, after a magical manner, to make them more fruitful in the following year." "Concerning which I shall add no more (says Bishop Patrick), but that nothing could be more contrary to nature, and therefore more agreeable to the institutions of the devil, than to boil any young creature in the milk of its mother, which they both offered to the gods, and themselves ate of, besides sprinkling it, as already said."

Is this then the style of a good and true man declaring in a later age that Jehovah did, on a certain day, at a place called Sinai, command him to deliver, as direct from the Divine mouth, certain precepts to Israel, when all along the man knew it was not so, but that he himself only used this as a hopeful means of benefiting his people? And how, or when, did such a one acquire this peculiar concern for his people, and fall upon this peculiar style of carrying it out? He did not of course mean them to know that he *was* adopting such a plan of doing them good; but certainly intended them to believe that Jehovah was, according to the scheme, the real Speaker in the case. And is it so that Jews and Christians alike have all, till very lately, believed this; but that now it has come to be shown that the other view—we may call it *Expediency versus Truth*—is the correct one? And while the people about our Lord all shared in the mistaken belief, are we content to say that He, without any disparagement of His claims as *the Revealer of God*, both shared it with them, and proclaimed it to the world? Where, in short, at this rate are we to seek for religion or morality? It may be 'criticism,' but it is such as can only destroy, not build; criticism which leads to no order, only to confusion and chaos; for its first business is to cut from under us that basis of truth and honesty on which we were depending for so much. And it is astounding to see to

what a length it has now reached in its stealthy march, so that what would not have been listened to very shortly ago has now won credit from thousands, while thousands more are on the road to the same conclusion. Hence, looking on the multitudes who simply declare that they cannot make up their minds, it seems high time to sound forth the call, "How long halt ye between two opinions?"—"I would thou wert cold or hot."

The Code, then, is finished and followed up (xxiii. 20–33) with a prospective view of the Divine leading, in order to the entering of Canaan. Is that also only a blind to the eye, to keep it away from the fact that Canaan had been entered long before—while the professedly ancient Code became, for the first time at this late date, that actual thing which might serve the purpose of its designers? Surely, the very idea of artifice so complicated—and in an atmosphere of such transparent simplicity—might at once dissipate all the theories which it is designed to support.

And then, as for the Code itself, it is no small thing that it served for all the ages of Israel's nationality. *Without* it there had been only anarchy, waiting for such doubtful remedy as time and circumstance might bring. But *with* the Code, and its Divine Author always at hand to support it, it sufficed for the people, through the storms of international strife and the worse dangers of national corruption, until Shiloh came, and the great purpose was served that "in Abraham and his seed all the nations of the earth should be blessed."

Observe now what first followed this Covenant Code. It is the word spoken to Moses (xxiv. 1, 2) before leaving the advanced position where the charge had been delivered, "Come thou up to the Lord, thou and Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, and seventy of the elders of Israel; and worship ye afar off. And Moses alone shall come nigh to the Lord, but they shall not come nigh; neither shall the people go up with him."

See, then, the position of Moses; for it is perfectly distinct. He, by himself, is on the spot already specified, and there he receives two charges, each requiring him to go down to the people. One of these is that he shall deliver to them the new statutes (xxi. 1); the other is that he convey, to those named, the call to accompany him in a fresh ascent. This leads to the very grand transaction next recorded, and that is nothing less than the ratification of the Covenant.

Now this last small portion of the narrative is in the highest degree remarkable, whether as regards its subject-matter or the naturalness of the style. Such qualities will be overlooked by the eye that is eagerly following every turn of the keen dissecting knife, which is to resolve it into its elements. But there are those whose gaze having been turned to the points of subject and style now indicated, have no power to resist the conviction that the body, thus taken in hand, is strong enough to resist all dissection, and to assert in the clearest tones its own claims to a healthy vitality.

Before proceeding, we shortly notice the way in which this 'Code' is regarded 'critically.' "The laws themselves are taken naturally from a pre-existing source, though their form in particular cases may be due to the compiler who united J and E into a whole." (Driver, *p.* 33.) As to particulars, (1) The final exhortation (xxiii. 23–25) *anticipates unduly* verse 27, &c. Now one looks and looks again, and asks, Where is that *undue anticipation* which makes the order of thought unsuitable for a Divine communication?

It is this:

Verse 23, "Mine angel shall go before thee," &c.

Verse 24, "Thou shalt not bow down to their gods," &c.

Verse 25, "Ye shall serve the Lord," &c. *After which* it is an offence against good order to say, as in *v.* 27, "I will send my fear before thee"!

(2) Another blot is that verses 23–25 disguise the *conditional* character of 25, 26, which are dependent on verse 22. As if

He who *expressed* the *if* in verse 22 could not be allowed to keep it in His mind as *implied in the subsequent verses!*

(3) "The verses xxiii. 4, 5, can hardly be in their original position; for the context on both sides relates to a subject of a different kind, *just judgment.*" Now (1) It would be difficult in so miscellaneous a collection of precepts to say what was *too miscellaneous* for propriety. (2) It is hard to see how the subject of this righteous treatment of an enemy is out of place here. (3) If, after all, there is dislocation (but who shall pronounce it?), it would seem better to charge that on some scribe than to call in a J and E, compilers in 800 B.C., to explain it.

Before the ratification there comes, of course, the publication of the Covenant. So "Moses came, and told the people all the words of the Lord, and all the judgments." That one sentence outweighs a library of criticism. "Moses came;" yes, came from that spot within the thick darkness, came to the people, and "told them all the judgments," with which he had just been charged. This is given as one fact, true at once physically and morally. "And the people answered with one voice, All that the Lord hath said will we do." That is another fact; and the one fact is just as distinct as the other. And here is one more, "*Moses wrote all the words of the Lord.*" He was, we know, in the habit of writing, and thus he made up "the book of the covenant" (as in *v.* 7.) "And he rose up early in the morning, and builded an altar under the hill, and twelve pillars, according to the twelve tribes of Israel." "And he sent young men which offered burnt-offerings, and sacrificed peace-offerings to Jehovah." So do we find facts crowded upon facts —real facts—or what?

Thus early did Moses put into practice the directions that had followed the Decalogue, so bringing out the indissoluble connection between *law*, *guilt*, and *sacrifice*. "And he took the book of the covenant, and read in the audience of the people, and they said, "ALL that Jehovah hath said will we

do, and be obedient." Is it possible then, that not one such movement then took place, nor that one such word was spoken? Is it possible that such sentences were only framed long afterwards from floating traditions, or exhumed from certain old documents by some editor, piously concerned to tempt the people of his day to obedience, through the influence of those pretended professions of piety? And if so, was there ever heard of, before or since, so clumsy an expedient for dealing with men's souls? Rather, as no law had as yet been given for those minute sacrificial directions, it can only be supposed that they were given now, with all the other directions, and if given why not written also with the others? "And Moses took the blood, and sprinkled it on the people, and said, Behold the blood of the covenant, which the Lord hath made with you concerning these words." And how deeply all this had sunk into the national mind may be seen from the Epistle to the Hebrews (ix. 18–21). Nor can it be doubted that the additional point there introduced had been faithfully handed down among the memorable facts of that day. It is a case in which a supplement by tradition of one great fact beautifully confirms the original accounts. The fact is this, "He *sprinkled both the book*, and all the people"; yes, the spotless book, as well as the guilty people. For the demand of the law-book was for the guilty lives. And the sprinking of the blood, with its atoning life (Lev. xvii. 11, R.V.), was the strongest possible expression of how the demand was met, and the guilty set free. So weighty is the matter religiously. But from a literary point of view, how this last got in, except as an actual pendant to the rest, it is hard to see. This brings us now to

The United Ascent of the Mount.

Chap. xxiv., 9–18: "Then went up Moses and Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, and seventy of the elders of Israel."

This had been ordered in verse 1, but is only now carried

out, for another order had preceded, as given in xxi. 1. So the prior one, being now fully settled by the ratification of the Covenant, the second (xxiv. 1) is at once taken up. All this stands out before us in the written page—the eye having only to turn from xxi. 1, where the first order is given, to xxiv. 3, where it is fulfilled; and for the second order from xxiv. 1 to verse 9. But how, except for downright reality, were such points thus smoothly combined in narration? The things were not commanded together, nor could they be executed together, and yet they are recorded together, as their actual connection required. Were such orders then never really given? And how, if only fictitious, did they all get together for performance in this easy, natural manner? The order of xxi. 1 is simply, *as a matter of fact*, carried out in xxiv. 3, but without any verbal reference backwards; and not only is the original order 'to set forth the judgments' strictly fulfilled, but all is done that was designed in connection with that, and which, though not mentioned, we must assume from all principle and analogy to have been fully enjoined as gone through in *vv.* 4–8. With perfect confidence then we say that this was no sort of material for either *document* or *tradition* to have handled in such a style; while it is plain that no colouring by a compiler can be thought of among facts which, as we have them, are still so perfectly colourless. And as for *artifice*, it should be enough that, whatever that was capable of, it was not capable of turning out a narrative so palpably inartificial. For just consider the separate points and then review this joint presentation of them.

(1) There is the *command* to lay certain statutes about to be given before the people.

(2) These are *delivered* to Moses for this purpose.

(3) Moses, still on the low part of the mount, receives a fresh order for an ascent higher, and that with a company which is specified.

(4) This of course involves the preliminary step of coming

down among the people to make arrangements for the new ascent.

(5) He now executes the first order, namely, to speak to the people the statutes as delivered to him.

(6) With this he combines all that properly went with it in the way of sacrifice, and which, in accordance with all analogy, we assume as prescribed to him at the same time.

(7) Having arranged all this, he ascends the mount with the company named.

Now all this stands well together in the narrative, so long as each article has its own ground to rest on; but if that be denied, the harmony is unaccountable. The concoction of such things as facts in such an order is not conceivable. It does not even appear that the writer was designing to adjust the various points of meeting. He merely tells the facts in the order in which they happened, and the whole adjusts itself. Such an adjustment in such a case may be taken as a demonstration of the reality of the events without which it was impossible.

Next comes the Ascent, with the Spectacle. The solemnity, grandeur, and soberness of the account are all remarkable. There is nothing mean, nothing falsely sublime here, and the design is of the most practical kind. What these men saw and what they felt, with the full consciousness of ordinary existence (for "they did eat and drink"), might well make on them a life-long impression. It was only the footstool of the Divine Majesty that had come out to full view, and if that was so overwhelmingly grand what would have been the glory of the throne? for even that footstool represented the highest ideal of material splendour that such minds could frame. It appeared "like a paved work of sapphire stone, and as the body of heaven for clearness." It was needful then that these Hebrews should see as much of Divine reality to fit them the better for earthly ministry, and needful that here the display should cease.

The whole company having now witnessed this inspiring spectacle, Moses is called still to ascend; and it is the very practical view of the immediate object of this that stamps this new order with the reality that we are in quest of. "The Lord said to Moses, Come up to Me into the mount, and be there, and I will give thee tables of stone, and a law and commandment, which I have written; that thou mayest teach them." Now this must include the Decalogue at least, with the stone tables as put into the hands of Moses. And it must include also a real voice of God as declaring it all; else what value, what truth can it have? But if there be as much of reality as this here, what is there elsewhere to stumble us? Suppose it be hard to believe? Suppose also it be impossible to disbelieve. And this is just the impossibility that so many of the best and wisest have felt.

Having received this call, "Moses rose up, and his minister Joshua: and Moses went up into the mount of God." That is to say, such was the fact, and Moses will tell it—no more and no less. To this is added another fact, "And he said unto the elders, Tarry ye here for us, until we come again to you; and, behold, Aaron and Hur are with you: if any man have any matters to do, let him come unto them." (*v.* 14.) Here is the last word of Moses, before ascending, as now required. It is nothing less than a business transaction. And it is just such specifications of time, place, person, circumstance, that lift matters like these out of the sphere of myth and plant them in the solid ground of fact. It might even serve some purpose, if someone would count up for himself how many distinct matters are wrapped up in these parting words.

And there is still something more. With a view to the guidance of the elders, Aaron and Hur are left with them, and will, at the same time, be ready in the leader's absence to direct in any case of need *among the people.* Here is another *circumstance* important in itself; but beyond that it clearly involves more; it implies communication on both sides, between the

elders and the people, by which alone the action of the two chief men could be brought into requisition. Now the question for the historical student is, What view does all this give of the *circumstances* of the law-giving? And how does it bring out a direct *actor*, first witness, and original narrator?

All this, then, is eminently natural—as natural as the account by anyone of some transaction with his friends yesterday. And precisely in the same style, as natural and real, is the account that has preceded, and the one that now follows, of these wonderful dealings between Moses and Jehovah that are objected to by so many as drawing too largely on their faith. "Moses went up into the mount, and a cloud covered the mount. And the glory of Jehovah abode upon mount Sinai, *and the cloud covered it six days;* and the seventh day He called unto Moses out of the midst of the cloud. And the sight of the glory of the Lord was like devouring fire on the top of the mount in the eyes of the children of Israel. And Moses went into the midst of the cloud, and gat him up into the mount; and Moses was in the mount forty days and forty nights." Facts again, various and weighty, wonderful and simple; but still *facts*, and that is their value. And in answer to all the allegations of myth, we say, among the many other things that are to be said, But what of the *facts?* For in the train of human thought they must have their place. And of place for them we can find none here, but the place of reality. And it is hard if this reality be refused simply because the writer professes to introduce us into a stage higher than the earthly. When a genius like Milton tries the same, he taxes himself to the utmost, and leaves us with but a picture to stir our souls, by the grandeur and vividness of his ideas. With Moses there is no question as to genius, no taxing, no picture; with him it is only *sight* and *voice*, and these supported on every side by the simplest and most substantial of human *facts*. It is such things as these combined—every point in short within the chapter, every command, every incident, every movement,

every connection—it is these which make us feel that the narrative is as remote from all mistake or pretence, as the character of Moses from that of an Indian juggler.

Chapter xxiv. is thus treated by the critical method. It is partitioned between E and P. Verse 18 (second part, 'gathim up') is E's introduction to xxxi. 18 (second part), the intervening chapters all belonging to P. Again, verses 15–18 (first part) are P's introduction to xxv.–xxxi. (Driver, p. 34.) Hence, it seems, this chapter and the following ones are *not from Moses*, and from whom no one knows! Thus all the moral evidence that we have seen for originality and unity goes for nothing before the dissecting knife of this new art!

PART SECOND.

It seems difficult to turn off to a second part, and yet the subject is entirely new, while the unity between the two parts is perfect. There is the same character, style, mind. The place is the same, and the only difference in time is that of immediate succession. There is as little of self-assertion—with all the new honours—in the one as in the other; but the same calm, earnest, self-forgetting narrative of personal facts. There is no effort on the part of the writer, as if he would say, 'Now for something new,' but the easiest possible gliding into the subject as smoothly as day follows day. For he is still on the one ground, and the two subjects are to him one; for the new part is an essential member of the organic whole. The previous institutions, though given through Moses at Sinai, were, upon the whole, fit for mankind. But now, since Israel is a peculiar people for Jehovah, it is fit that this speciality be distinctly provided for. And yet here is another unity; for this very dealing with Israel is to prepare for the dealing with mankind, when "the fulness of the time is come." Now if all this be not one divine system, what is it?

Thus we have the same Moses continuing, in the same spirit, the revelation which Jehovah makes to him of matters entirely new. And this man, after all the fresh honours showered upon him, is still *nothing;* Jehovah and His revelations are *the all.* With these, on Israel's behalf, Moses is wholly engrossed. Now here is a problem—call it moral, intellectual, literary, or psychological in any sense—How, without entire unity of fact, there ever came about this deep unity in all else? And as to the narration, what is it, what can it be, but the direct utterance of the highest life? Talk of a collection of documents; no such documents—even if possible—could have made up this living unity. Talk of the cloud of tradition as it floated along—the idea is still more preposterous.

I. The Tabernacle.

Chap. xxv.–xxxi.

xxv. And Jehovah spake to Moses. Yes, Jehovah who had brought this man closer to Himself than creature had ever been since man fell—*He* spake to him. And who was the Jehovah, but the same who had appeared to Abraham on the plains of Mamre (Gen. xviii.); the Jehovah of Mount Moriah, called also "the Angel of Jehovah" (xxii.); He who, under the same twofold designation, appeared to Gideon (Judges vi. vii.); Manoah (xiii.); the high priest, Joshua (Zech. iii.), and others? And, if there be such a person in the Godhead, shall we turn away simply because He thus graciously condescends to speak to men? Shall we find fault if the all-creating, God-revealing, Word, before His manifestation in the flesh, shall approach so near to our fellow-man by such flashes of His Deity, and voices of His mouth, in anticipation of the appearance of Jehovah-Jesus? If there be mystery here, it seems rather to be in the midday Sun of the New Covenant than in the morning dawn of the Old. And the whole comes out in words like these, "He, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake to our

fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken to us by His Son." (Heb. i. 1.) To which add the direct testimony, "That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, of the Word of Life," &c. (1 John i. 1.)

Before proceeding, we may here say a word about the compiler according to the new criticism, of the portion we have come to. Properly enough it is P. For this, if anything, should belong to the *Priests' Code*. But how can that be? is the natural question, when P was known to us as the great Elohist, from Genesis i. and onwards, and when the use of the *name* was the chief distinction between him and the Jehovist. True, but he gave up that character we are told in Exodus vi., and now he is a real Jehovist. But was there not some vital bond between him and the Elohim name which led him to use it as his chief characteristic? We should have thought so, but now it seems otherwise from the ease with which it was given up; and thus we feel utterly unable to account either for the original usage or the change; one thing only being plain, that the *name* had nothing to do with either P or his style. And so, as to his new usage, we can only conclude the same.

Now this circumstance leads at once to a curious idea as to the supposed employment of the names. For why, in this case, was 'Elohim' first taken up and then laid down? The famous priest of Ezekiel's day, if he knew anything, knew sufficiently, from the first, what had preceded and what had followed Exodus vi., as to the use of the name. Hence we can only ask, Why act as he did? Did document bring him his materials, stamped 'Elohim' for Genesis, and 'Jehovah' afterwards? But that could hardly be, considering the frequent use of 'Jehovah' from the very first. And any such regular distinctiveness in the successive document makers would bring us too near to the idea of that impossible series, already examined, of writers under the separate classes keeping up

from age to age their respective features. Of tradition we need hardly speak now; for the difficulty would only be the greater. And if either document or tradition be imagined to have come unstamped into the possession of P, then the question still presses, What led him to affix in this most arbitrary manner the one stamp to Genesis and the other afterwards? Thus, in fact, the whole question is raised, and the difficulty comes up in its genuine dimensions—how P could, at that late date, attempt to deal with the overwhelming mass of material imagined to have come before him, whether in solid document or impalpable tradition, stamping each article with the one name or the other, and to some extent surely with the features, which are supposed to be his own? Strange, if we feel no disposition to escape from this intricate and barren jungle into the open and fruitful field—"Jehovah spake unto Moses."

The burden then of what Jehovah now spake to Moses is this: "Speak to the children of Israel, that they . . . make Me a sanctuary; that I may dwell among them" (chap. xxv. 1, 8).

And with this comes the most exact specification of the materials to be gathered by the people for this work, precisely as if the house were just on the point of building, and as if the man, receiving the present directions for the *material*, would, in due time, know equally well as to the *construction*. For as to that, the order is simply, "According to all that I show thee, after the pattern of the tabernacle, and the pattern of all the instruments thereof, even so shall ye make it." A style this, extremely like what the thing here professes to be, but extremely unlike the hypothesis of time and circumstance entirely different. And this, by the way, is not a matter that we can imagine as abandoned to tradition. That of which the pattern was thus made could not have been left without its record also.

Thus is given out the order with equal authority and kindness,

"Let them make Me a sanctuary; that I may dwell among them." They have done much, and they will do more, to drive Him from their midst. But He will not be driven—He will "dwell among them."

In this simple sentence we have a key to the whole house and its arrangements. Everything about it shall signify God's dwelling with Israel as in a *tent of meeting* (*ohēl moēdh*)—between Himself and them—in which He can "commune with them" of all that is in His heart for their good. From no heathen temple ever heard of is this house patterned. And if, in any of its arrangements, it approaches the idea of these, that is only because even they have some essential truth at the bottom. So far, therefore, will Jehovah's house correspond with these. Thus the heathen worship may have, for its primary element, propitiatory sacrifice; but that would only be from the corruption of God's original appointment, as the way of access to Himself for the guilty. If the heathen temples have their indwelling deity, that is because, from the first, God has shown that He would, in very deed, dwell with men upon the earth. Yes, and the very feasts, by which the heathen absurdly thought to regale their gods, were but their travesty of the grand truth that God was seeking a real satisfaction to Himself from the right affections, and actions, of His worshippers. Thus the corrupt fragments of truth which appeared in the world's temples served no less a purpose than to suggest the true ideas underlying the corruption—with all the horrid mutilation which the truth had undergone in the development of idolatry—no account being now taken of practices purely diabolical. As to the ordinary train of worship, however, while allowing for the infinite distance between the sacred bull on the one hand, receiving his devotees amid the splendours of the Egyptian fane; and on the other, the God of Israel dwelling between the cherubim—still does the degrading corruption of the one scene point in the same direction as the uncorrupted symbol in the other—a symbol

which, instituted on Sinai, is carried out in the whole life of God's family on earth, and consummated in the heavenly Jerusalem. "Behold the tabernacle of God is with men, and He will dwell among them."

Now such is the key to the house—the command for this *meeting place*—between Israel and Jehovah to be made from the people's free will and substance, and this, as the basis of all, followed up by prescriptions which equally speak for themselves. And the cardinal point in the present argument is this that, by determinedly following out so simple a principle, we most conclusively find, without any fancy of man, ancient or modern, that the Tabernacle with all its arrangements does, in a marvellous and unmistakable way, symbolise the Gospel and its blessings. So perfect indeed is the correspondence that, when thus seen, the conclusion is irresistible that the Mosaic rites do as surely point to definite Christian facts as the needle to the Pole; and it is no wonder if, with this conclusion, there goes the conviction that the Author of the one is the Author of the other—that, without the Gospel to follow, the Law could never have preceded; while, on the other hand, the Gospel revelation is indebted to the Law, first, for its formal introduction into the world, and then, point after point, as being the development of a seed which no evolution brought forth, and no chance or art matured; for not more certainly is the oak in the acorn than the great plan of Messiah's work was deposited by God Himself in the rites of the Old Covenant. The whole is the product of the one eternal mind —the mind which devised that dawn should be followed by noon, and infancy by manhood. Further than this we may not now go. Less cannot, with justice, be said for either Law or Gospel.

Of this principle we will venture to give a simple example. It is the case of the Ark in the Holy of Holies. Here we have a fundamental correspondence in the common view of the indwelling Deity, with diametrical opposition between the

action as portrayed by Moses, and as carried out in the worship of Egypt. In the latter case we have the pretended incarnation of Osiris in the sacred bull quietly awaiting amid the splendours of the temple the adoration of the people. It is the apotheosis of folly, "They that make them are like unto them." In the Hebrew tabernacle, on the other hand, is provided a symbolical abode of Jehovah, with just enough to bring out, visibly and vividly, the reality and character of His action. But then this Jehovah is a Lawgiver, and not one without a law worthy of Him, however much man might have desired that. And that law is holy and just as well as good—sin-forbidding and sinner-condemning. How then shall the worshipper approach such a One with His necessary demand for the transgressor's life? That need has been met. First, the indispensable law is there, but covered up in the well-fastened golden ark. And besides the material covering—which of itself would go no way—there has been provided the singular *covering* of the atoning (Heb. *covering*) blood. That virtue belongs to it through its containing the life of the ransoming victim. This blood the high priest now puts upon the sacred lid, as the symbolical covering for his own sin. His meaning seems all that can be plain. It is as if he said, "Thou, O Law, demandest my life. This other life, appointed by the Lawgiver Himself, I bring as my discharge." The idea is original and unique. Other religions had taught no such lesson as to law and atonement, however really it might have been buried at the heart of them. And no religion has come near to taking up the idea but the religion of Christ. The Jews, as a mass, never entered into it For a time they kept up the form, and then gave up even that; for while there was in human nature the felt necessity for some such provision there is nothing more alien to the human heart than to treat fairly *this* provision. Enough for us now that there is no source to which it can be traced up high enough but the Divine mind itself; and most perfect is the correspondence

between the Old Covenant and New in this. You see it developed in Rom. iii. 23–26. "All have sinned, and come short of the glory of God" (cf. *v.* 19). That is, all, by sinning, have forfeited the eternal life of glory (*v.* 23). But such sinners can be *freely justified through the redemption that is in Christ* (*v.* 24). And how comes this redemption? Because God has set forth Christ as a PROPITIATORY COVERING *through faith in His blood* (*v.* 25). The end being that God might be at once just, and justify the believing sinner (*v.* 26). Thus the great Apostle—through that Spirit who took the things of Christ and showed them to him—understood and expounded for the world the symbol of the propitiatory covering, and thus is perfectly substantiated in our Redeemer the whole shadow of the Mosaic symbol. This is not the place to discuss that modern view by which the symbol pointed simply to the personal life-blood, or moral devotion, of the worshippers as offered to Jehovah. Our questions in such a discussion would be (1) What sort of *attachment* there was between such a conception and the symbolic fact? (2) What appearance there was of the *realised* EXECUTION of the principle alleged? and (3) Whether this can possibly be the view which the Apostle here means to express?

What then shall we now say of this Mosaic provision of the *propitiatory covering*, whether viewed by itself or in relation to Christ? Is it merely a human thing? or is it certainly Divine? Or take it thus, If we consider the Apostle's word about Christ the *Propitiatory Covering* we see at once that it required a key to open up its *specific* verbal *meaning*. But there is no key possible but the Mosaic Propitiatory. Is it a matter of chance then, or of fancy, or what, that lock and key do so remarkably answer here? Can it be more than one hand from which they came? And can that hand be any but God's?

The Directions for the Tabernacle.

How then, let us ask, were these communicated? To this there is but one answer, if we will let the record speak; and our concern is to look well into the moral character of the answer. Now God, besides showing a pattern of the whole, spoke to Moses every word of it (xxv. throughout). There is not a sentence without "Thou shalt make," "It shall be." If now God thus spoke, and Moses thus received and transmitted the record, then the writing is simply a heaven-inspired communication. But if God did not so speak, what of the multiplied assertions that He did? Are these true or false, or both? If true, we have God's word outright, with the occasion and mode of it; while for stray documents with other date, design, origin, there is no room here; and as to Tradition as the vehicle of the information, it becomes a grand impertinence. But if these assertions are false, why not have done with them at once, and admit that we know nothing about the matter? There will still remain, it is true, a very curious study in human nature—that is all. As for the man who could thus put into the mouth of the Most High lie upon lie, till the measure ran over—lies as to the most solemn dealings of God with man, and man with God—the one doing this, the other that, and all a lie—what shall we say? The world's falsehoods often startle us enough, but this outdoes them all. And if there be any ethical code by which such assertions are not lies—any new critical calculus showing how we may properly believe both the lies and their contrary, then so much the worse for morality and humanity; for then we shall be only further out on the ocean of a more hopeless corruption.

The Golden Altar.

Chap. xxx. 1–10.

Here comes the order for the Altar of Incense, and the position of it has been made the occasion of loud outcry

against the history; for why not have put this, it is said, into its proper place amid the furniture? Hence it seems as if either there had been no altar at all, or no such order for it as here intimated. Thus we may regard the thing as either an anachronism or a fictitious appendage; either of which suppositions would be fatal to the integrity of the narrative. Now why assume that the Divine Architect of the Tabernacle would certainly have followed *our* idea of order? Instead of finding any objection to one continuous communication we might rather surely find an argument for the soundness of the present narrative; for why was it thus written if not because thus ordered? And if either there was no altar at all, or no such place as this assigned to it, why could not the respectable *redactor* of our Exodus have kept clear of the present difficulty? Anyone who had forged or accepted so many falsehoods could have had no difficulty in adding another by putting this altar in what, it is said, *was its right place;* and yet where, after all, is the difficulty? He who prescribed it may surely be allowed His own order; and even *we* may be allowed, without presumption, to think we can see a certain beauty and propriety in the arrangement. For why might not that which furnished the climax and consummation of the whole Tabernacle furniture —that which brought out beyond all else man's communion with God as the fruit of all the atonements—why might not this be reserved for the last and most imposing place?

The following will show the style, and perhaps something more, of the critical writers in a matter like this:—"It is undeniable * that Exod. xxx. and xxxi. cannot be placed in the same line with xxv.–xxix. No reason can be assigned why the author of xxv., &c., if he intended to mention the golden altar, should have failed to include it in the previous passage. That it is first mentioned in chapter xxx. can only be understood as the assumption that that, with xxxi., was added by a later author."

* Wellhausen, *Pentateuch*, *Encyc. Britt.*, p. 507.

(Verses 11–38.) The few matters that now follow, namely, the Ransom Money, Laver, Anointing Oil, and Perfume, are evidently in their appropriate place as supplementary to the main articles of furniture. And was it Tradition, or pure Mosaic record, that put such things into their appropriate order? And let it be added that this would be a question continually recurring.

The Architect Appointed.

xxxi. 1–11.

All arrangements being now prescribed, the architect is divinely appointed, with a helper. "See, I have called, by name, Bezaleel, the son of Uri, the son of Hur, and I have filled him with the Spirit of God in wisdom and understanding; and in the hearts of all that are wise hearted I have put wisdom, that they may make all that I have commanded thee." These are, the Tabernacle, Ark, Mercy-seat, Table, and Candlestick, Two Altars, and Laver, with the service cloths, and holy garments, the Anointing Oil and Perfume, with various accessory 'furniture.' It is all extremely life-like, both in *matter* and *manner*, and the very repetition of it is peculiarly so. The grand point in the internal evidence is this, that all is thus professedly detailed *before the doing of the work;* and yet not in the way of a specious prophecy, that Jehovah would do so and so, but in the way of minute prescription for *work now to be done.* Now was it not enough, if untrue, for the novelist to have shamelessly declared that Jehovah commanded certain things, and prepared certain agents—and hence the pretended work? But is it not much too gratuitous and unnatural to put Him into the needlessly false position of standing out in advance, and prescribing all that was to be done, and by whom, and how? Can we really believe that, after all, this was only a profane obtruding of the Living God on a stage on which there was no life at all—no reality in the

present for either workmen or worshippers—only a parade and pretence, undefinable either as to time or place, for the benefit of some far off future? And once more, Amid such complication of arrangement, and interlacing of circumstance, is it possible that we can betake ourselves to Tradition as an authority for it all?

If it be now urged that the directions, with the execution following, present simply one of the radical marks of P, as a feature which he is in the habit of stamping on his original material, the answer is that, if you remove such a feature, you leave no material to be stamped at all. *For such a feature embraces the entire fact.* It need hardly be added that this principle will equally apply to the whole range of such cases. And then what becomes of the position of P?

The Sabbath Sign.

Chap. xxxi. 12–17.

"*And* Jehovah spake unto Moses, saying, Speak thou *also* unto the children of Israel, saying." There are two words in this simple sentence—or the same word twice—which clearly bespeak the *oral continuation*, in contrast to all foreign source. It is the word '*and*,' '*also*.' Let us allow it, then, to speak for itself: say whether it was less than the Divine mouth that spoke it, and the Mosaic hand that wrote it. The word that follows is still more important, as entirely foreign to dead document, and significant of the living mouth, "*Verily*, My sabbaths ye shall keep." Nor was it any document, or tradition, that followed up this, sentence after sentence, with motive upon motive, and argument upon argument, and much besides, "*For* it is a sign between Me and you . . . that ye may know that I am Jehovah that doth sanctify you. . . . It is holy unto you [and then the penalty of disobedience]; six days may work be done, the seventh is the day of rest. . . . It is a sign between me and the children of Israel, for a perpetual covenant, for

ever; for in six days Jehovah made heaven and earth, and on the seventh day He rested and was refreshed."

One thing is peculiarly notable here. The other nations had their seven day time measure; Israel only had the holy Sabbath as a perpetual covenant, a link of fellowship with their God, who had first done a six days' work, and then rested. That these days were very long periods, as most suitable for the Almighty Workman, rather than man's days of a few hours, is a thought that should not stumble reason.

But why is it now that "*Jehovah* [not Elohim] made heaven and earth"? Does not that indicate a different authorship from Genesis i.? By no means. *Jehovah the God of Israel was Elohim* the Creator. And it was of prime importance in this place to emphasise that.

Whence then this peculiar insistence with Israel that they keep Jehovah's Sabbath? Is this *face-to-face-like-dealing* the style of tradition or *document?* Can a true critical ear catch any such sound out of any such means of conveyance? Or is it not really—according alike to criticism, reason, æstheticism, religion—just what it professes to be—the loving urgency of the Father God of Israel, pressing upon them as His firstborn, the peculiar treasure He had given them, and the peculiar practice thus entailed on them, by the grant of *His* Sabbath? By this they should be separated from all the world as a peculiar people to *Him.* Hence while among the ten commandments suitable for Israel and mankind alike, there had come in a Sabbath law, it was fit that to that there should be now appended this special appeal to the covenant people.

A very distinct note of truth immediately follows this (*v.* 18). It is the statement of a matter of fact, but bound up with sentiment the deepest and holiest. "He gave unto Moses, when He had made an end of communing with him on Mount Sinai, tables of testimony — tables of stone — written with the finger of God." Yes, the finger of *God, not of man.* It was *Jehovah's law—Elohim's writing.* Moses had

written the book of the covenant (xxiv. 4, 7), though God alone may commit the great law to the tables.

What then shall we say to all this? If it be fact with all its simplicity, it sets forth God's dealings with man, in the style most suitable for introducing that dispensation which was to prepare for the manifestation of God in the flesh. And reason, if it can accept of the latter view, need not stumble over the prior one. But if it be not fact, then let any one count for himself the gratuitous falsehoods which it contains, and account for them if he can on some more reasonable basis than that—though certainly falsehoods anywhere else—they may be called truths here.

The Golden Calf.

Chap. xxxii.–xxxiv.

All was now ready for the construction of the Tabernacle; Moses being still on the mount receiving the God-inscribed tables for the sacred chest. Meanwhile there occurs an extraordinary circumstance which before proceeding farther the writer must tell, with the fresh communications which it entailed. Apart from stern fact, we may safely conclude that the melancholy episode would never have been written. To invent such a slander against the people had absolutely nothing to suggest it; and, as concerns Aaron, such a thing is, if possible, still more incredible. But indeed the account is as circumstantial, direct, and succinct as the strictest credibility could demand. To present all the inherent evidence of reality would be to insist upon every line in the passage. Still it cannot be passed by without a fair measure of analysis. It was exactly a case in which romance would have gaily disported itself, with its kaleidoscope of the grotesque. Hence the want of the one will be a fair presumption of the absence of the other. And, as to any tinge of grotesqueness here, it is clearly as foreign to the writer's taste as to that of the severest

critic. And while artistically pure in this respect—which is not a small thing—the style shows more than that. Nothing can be less like a mere *acting of life*, nothing more clearly like *life in action.*

Let us see then how the matter begins, and how it advances. xxxii. 1: "When the people saw that Moses delayed to come down out of the mount." And is that made up? Was there no seeing of delay? no delay to be seen? "The people gathered themselves together unto Aaron, and said to him." Is that too made up? Was there no gathering at all; or none for such a purpose? "Up, make us gods which shall go before us." It is an extraordinary ebullition of impatience and ungodliness. Is it then only made up? "For this Moses, the man that brought us up out of the land of Egypt, we wot not what is become of him." Wonderful conclusion from the knowing and not knowing. He did bring us out of Egypt; we know that; but for these forty days he has been where we know not. "Up, therefore, make us gods that we can see, trust, follow." Is that also only contrived? Or did unstable tradition take it all up, and give it all out with such wonderful precision? This steady march from the fact of the delay to the whirlpool of the idolatry—with such a picture of the state of mind that linked them—is that only a fiction? Verse 2: "And Aaron said to them, Break off the golden earrings," &c. Perhaps he said more. But no words are spent over it. Our author is one who could be sparing of words. To invent parleying is not his forte, only to relate action. Still this much we have. And the account of Aaron's act is extremely graphic—"Break off the earrings of your wives, sons, and daughters, and *bring them to me.*" They treat Aaron as one on whom they could reckon in their mad impatience. And he takes up their case as undauntedly as they could wish—"*Bring them to me.*" He meant possibly the opposite of what appeared. But the silence as to all such matters is just another index of simple fact.

Verse 3: "And all the people brake off the golden earrings which were in their ears, and brought them unto Aaron." It is needless to argue from that, for it is only the reflection of the preceding spectacle.

Verse 4: And he received them at their hand, and fashioned it with a graving tool, after he had made it a molten calf." We need not ask whether the calf was all of gold, or of wood so encased. That may be left to individual judgment. We believe the former. As to what the calf pointed to, we simply assume the bull Apis, which again was the representative of Osiris, and stood in the forefront of Egyptian worship. Such gorgeous idolatry as was bestowed upon that has never failed to impose upon the popular mind. The fascination was extreme even upon strangers, as appears from the terms in which it is referred to by such writers as Herodotus and Pliny. Hence we can better appreciate the wild intoxication of the Hebrews, when, in the long absence of their imposing leader, they had allowed themselves to be swallowed up in the feverish remembrance of the Egyptian scene. Anyhow Aaron was expert at this business. And the writer evidently knows him well.

"And *they* said." Yes, Aaron has now left them to themselves. So *they* said, "*These* be thy gods, O Israel, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt." But why the plural *gods?* It is natural enough, when we think how a *single* poor god like this was hardly adequate to the service sought. Besides, they had asked for *gods* to be made. So they think they can now say of the one calf, "*These* be thy gods." It was natural also that, in withdrawing their allegiance from the one *Jehovah-Elohim*, they should divide it between a plurality of gods, as the mere *form* "Elohim" allowed them to do. Now that all this is only too accordant with the people's taste, at that date, appears from Joshua's reference (xxiv. 14), "Put away the gods which your fathers served on the other side of the flood, and in Egypt." And how deeply rooted the same

spirit continued to be we learn too plainly from Jeroboam's golden calves.

Verse 5. Aaron would now compromise, explain, adjust, so that in this their idolatry they *might not be idolaters!* Is it thus he would keep peace, at once with his conscience and with Jehovah; and yet, without breaking it with the rebels, would lead them, through their very idolatry, to the higher plane of a real Jehovah-worship? We may not say that such was his meaning. But it would be ingenious; and, if without precedent, of which we know nothing, it is certainly not without succession, of which we know much.

So, when Aaron saw it, he built an altar (one only) before it, and made proclamation and said, "To-morrow is a feast to *Jehovah.*" Thus apparently he would—by this *one* altar, and his proclamation in honour of Jehovah—throw in his straw of truth to stem the devouring current of the popular frenzy.

"A feast to Jehovah!" And for this they are ready, under Aaron's *title*, and with their own *purpose*. So (*v.* 6) "They rose up early on the morrow, and offered burnt-offerings and peace-offerings; and the people sat down to eat and to drink, and rose up to play." This also looks extremely like a thing not fabled, but done. We see also that both burnt and peace-offerings are regarded as matters known already. And it is the same when Moses issues the special prescriptions for their use.

So much for Aaron and the people. Now for Moses and God. And if the first account had so much evidence of reality, still more has the second. The first thing that strikes us is this, that Moses, who could be so succinct before, can be so full now. Can that be because, while he considered it enough, in the one case, to tell generally what he had been told, he had to detail, in the other, the weighty personal communications betwixt himself and Jehovah? Verse 7, "And Jehovah said unto Moses, Go, get thee down," &c. Such is the first intimation of what has occurred. And an extremely unlikely way, we suggest, it is of introducing it, *except that*

Moses was in the position asserted, and that there Jehovah conveyed to him the intimation. Most unlikely, that is to say, that, apart from all fact, the writer coined this most unnatural fable of the intimation.

"For thy people which thou hast brought out of the land of Egypt have corrupted themselves." *Thy* people! But why not *My?* Had Moses adopted them now? Never before, or after, had he uttered the thought, and no idea was more foreign to him than that of *my people Israel.* Yet it is here written that Jehovah said to him, '*Thy people Israel.*' And for what imaginable reason is it written, but just because it *was said?* From whose mouth but the One could come such a word?

Verse 8. "They have turned aside quickly out of the way which I commanded them." And then from the mouth of Jehovah there professedly comes to Moses a simple recital of the act which as yet the Divine eye alone had seen, and of the words which the Divine ear alone had heard. This, we submit, would, apart from truth, be far too artificial for the palpably inartificial style of the author here.

Verses 9, 10. "And Jehovah said to Moses, I have seen this people, and, behold, it is a stiff-necked people. Now, therefore, let Me alone, that My wrath may wax hot against them, that I may consume them; and I will make of thee a great nation." All inexplicable again, except on the ground of a genuine utterance. The intense anthropomorphism we can understand, *if real.* The *fiction* of it by a Moses, or some meaner scribe, we can take as only an insult to God and truth. Nor can we even imagine so grievous a want of the commonest sense in the writer who here gives evidence of so much. The great God *might* so speak; no man might *make* Him do so.

Here then is the grand crisis bringing with it its bright chance for Moses. And how does he take it? Verses 11–13. "And Moses besought Jehovah his God, and said, Why doth Thy wrath wax hot against Thy people, which Thou hast brought forth out of the land of Egypt, with great power

and a mighty hand? Wherefore should the Egyptians say, For mischief did He bring them out, to slay them in the mountains, and to consume them from the face of the earth? Turn from Thy fierce wrath, and repent of this evil against Thy people. Remember Abraham, Isaac, and Israel, Thy servants," &c. &c.

The minor evidence of the credibility of this is that here we have a word distinctly spoken at the time and in the circumstances as they are described. The people have just come out of Egypt in defiance of all Egypt's power. And how richly will the Egyptians be avenged if only the threatened act be executed, for they will see it, and proudly speak of it, in that view, and that not only in general terms. They will not fail to notice that Israel's God, being weary of them, has even inveigled them *among the mountains* for their ruin! What is this if not a peculiarly heathen mode of thought and speech, such as Moses well knew that the Egyptians would surely indulge in?

Such we may call a minor evidence, although it is not small. But what of Moses and the bright chance? The question is answered by another, Who but a man intensely true and godly and good could have accepted the proposal as this man did? And how could such a man ever weave that black tissue of blasphemy and absurdity which this, if fiction, would involve—and for the benefit of whom? While, on the other hand, how could the so-called Moses, if only a shameless pretender, have carried out the action ascribed to Moses here? To say that he only pretended, in his weak humility, to have had a chance and nobly threw it away, is to say that he represented himself in a light so despicably mean as to forfeit all right except to contempt.

Verse 14. "And Jehovah repented Him of the evil which He thought to do to His people." No theory, observe—no explanation—only anthropomorphism, the most pure and simple that can be imagined, by which God comes to man as near as

condescension will allow, while yet He submits to no lowering of His eternal Majesty.

Mark now, all this extraordinary expression of sentiment is no abstract thing. As a matter of fact it has its time and place; it is while Moses is still on the mount. And thus has strangely been fulfilled the charge to the elders, "Aaron and Hur are with you; if any man have any matter to do, let him come to them" (xxv. 14). It is a fair question surely whether this charge at the beginning of the forty days, and this strange application of it at the end, indicates a unity in the narrative that connects them; or rather if there be some occult want of continuity which obliges us to separate them? Anyhow it was extremely unlike the much-favoured Tradition to put things together in that fashion.

Verse 15, &c. Moses now enters upon a more level, because purely human, ground. What follows is thus all simple in idea, but extremely important, being facts—all evidential—because having no kind of claim to be here, except that they are true. Nor are these facts at all suitable for document, while most worthy of record by the witness and actor. Thus Moses, attended by Joshua, comes down from the mount, and the two tables in his hand. The noise in the camp as they approach first attracts them, and they freely speak their impressions of it—Joshua, as the younger, hearing the more quickly; but Moses judging the more correctly. Even this having no colour but that of simple narrative has a decided value. And now the extraordinary scene bursts upon them—the calf and the dancing. In an instant the tables are thrown down and broken by the enraged Leader, while, without asking a question, he sends the calf back to the fire, grinds it to powder, strews that on the water, and makes the people drink. It was an extraordinary way, but the most admirably suitable, of meeting the heartrending occasion. It seems, in fact, that Moses came down from the mount with a cloud of judgment resting on him and a commission to execute it. The moment

he reaches the camp the cloud bursts, the lightning leaps out, and the judgment is executed. Such is the picture given of at once the mind and act of Moses. The one is the exact product of the other. The internal we can see as clearly as the external, and how to account for them apart we cannot tell, for in the light in which we see them they are cause and effect—correlative necessities; without the lightning in the mind there had been none against the calf; but that being there, it was impossible it should rest until the executed judgment had stayed it. And this mode of action was as needful for the people of Israel as it was for the feelings of Moses. No preface, no parley, would have suited him; none such would have helped them—action, action, is the immediate want. Words will follow. So the calf being in powder, and the people having drunk of the water, Moses quietly said to Aaron, "What did this people to thee that thou hast brought so great a sin upon them?" That the people have done something very wrong he doubts not, and as little that Aaron has been somehow tempted to forward it. With amazing coolness —in the full view of both sin and judgment—Aaron answers, showing at least that he is one who can 'speak.' But not even now does he seem to feel that he, who had been bold enough to make the people naked before their enemies, might have done something to stop them in their demand for the 'making of gods.' So his reply is the blandest possible, "Let not the anger of my lord wax hot; thou knowest the people that they are set on mischief. For they said to me, Make us gods which shall go before us. . . . And I said to them, whosoever hath any gold let him break it off. So they gave it to me: then I cast it into the fire, and there came out this calf"! Enough. No more parleying at present. Just one question now, "Who is on the Lord's side? Let him come to me." The answer is a full muster of the sons of Levi. At their leader's command they gird on their swords, pass through the camp, and carry out the work of judgment committed to them,

not staying their hand till there had fallen before them about three thousand men. It was the true Old Covenant style, with much of judgment, but more of mercy. And mercy it was both for that generation and all that followed. That the punishment was just cannot be disputed if the facts be at all allowed. And if just, then it was certainly expedient and salutary. If the dispensation under which it took place was good—that of "the schoolmaster leading to Christ"—then this present action was good also. But whatever difficulty or dislike may gather about the subject it should be enough that there is no reasonable accounting for the narrative with all its clear and strong characteristics—of which these are a part—except on the ground that it is entirely true.

Now all this it seems was the work of that one day—when Moses came down from the mount. Stupendous amount of work indeed, but most simply and soberly told by one who seems clearly to have known what he was saying, and who had no conceivable reason for crowding into the one day an amount of work really impossible. He must have seen as well as we how great the work was; he spends no word of eulogy on Moses for his extraordinary zeal; he merely tells without ambiguity what was done (and which he tacitly allows the possibility of) within that day, and for which indeed nothing can account but the lightning-like spirit of the man. Is it questioned then after all whether the thing as related was *possible?* Look again at the account. At the commencement of the work related no room is left, it will be seen, for other work—not even a word with Aaron—till the calf was in powder, *and that was the grand thing.* Only a few words with Aaron after that, and then the lightning-like action of the Levites—*and all is over.* Morally considered then the account, as of one day's work, stands out perfect, for it is contrary to the whole spirit of the piece that the burning of the calf should stand till the morrow, or that the judgment on the idolaters should be delayed for an hour. It would be the

statement of any such delay that would make the difficulty. Hence, instead of regarding *the one day* as an objection to the credibility of the account, we rather regard it as the contrary. It was, on the one hand, so peculiar that, but for truth, it would surely have been omitted. On the other hand, the essential style of the whole transaction explains what else might seriously puzzle us. And, after all, the question is, What *was* the operation on the calf which chiefly seems to us to have wanted time? And the answer to that we freely accept from one of the first of Egyptologists (Wilkinson, *Ancient Egypt*), from whom we quote. "An experienced chemist—says Goguet—has removed every difficulty on this subject, and suggested this simple process. In the place of tartaric acid, which we employ, Moses used *natron*, which is common in the East.... Nothing could have been more suitable as a punishment; for gold thus reduced, and made into a draught, has a most disagreeable taste." Let it be added that natron lakes were common in lower Egypt, hence the Israelites were familiar with it. Thus we may well allow that, somehow or other, they now had the means of thus employing it. And if that be too much, we must just fall back upon the mechanical process by which the work could certainly be done, and which in the present mental condition of Moses could easily have commanded as many strong arms as would make short work of it. Besides, if we take the recorded *making* of the calf as furnishing any clue in point of time, we cannot readily stumble at the shortness of the time allowed for the *unmaking*. Everything considered, we feel absolutely shut up to accept the moral evidence for the story as it stands.

Such was that day's work; and the non-extension of the time, although not quite accordant possibly with our modern calculations, seems only to show that the writer knew both the work and the time that it needed.

Having got thus far we may take a glance at the critical

objections to the unity of the history here. P, who had been the compiler from chapter xxv., has withdrawn for a time. It may be, we know not, that the style of xxxii. is too lively for his 'prosaic' pen. Be this as it may, "In the narrative of the golden calf this chapter, as a whole, may plausibly be assigned to E." Thus he who, like P himself, had been an Elohist all through Genesis, is no more distinguishable under that character. But not only so, "there are traces here of a double narrative, for verses 9–14 appear to have been expanded by the compiler of J E." That is vague enough. What follows is as definite. "Thus in chapter xxxii. 5" (at the end) "the people are commanded to do what, according to verse 4" (at the end) "they had already done." *Now is this true or not?* That is to say, Is the proclaiming *for to-morrow* by *Aaron* of a *feast to Jehovah* the same as the *people's saying to-day*, "*These be thy gods, O Israel*," &c.? "And this" (we are told) "confirms the *primâ facie* view, that verses 5, 6 are a doublet of verses 3, 4." After this, it is no wonder that no satisfactory analysis of this passage has ever been effected. "All that can be said is that if E be the basis of xxxiii. 1–6, it has been amplified by the compiler, possibly with elements derived from J." (Driver, p. 35.) And this is what is called 'Criticism'! To give it any other name is not our part.

We proceed now to the next day. The night having passed in rest and reflection, here is the result (*v.* 30). "It came to pass on the morrow, that Moses said to the people, Ye have sinned a great sin: and now I will go up to the Lord; peradventure I shall make an atonement for your sin." Let it be well understood then, that this pre-intimation of what Moses purposed to do is a circumstance quite over and above the record of the doing, and gives a reality and freshness, all its own, to the transaction; for it was in no way needful to the story, and to invent it would imply an amount both of the artistic and the artificial, far beyond what we can suppose

possible, and beyond the requirements of any sort of fiction within range of the time. But as to this proposed appeal to Jehovah, is there not some confusion? For has not that matter been already settled by the Divine answer to the original prayer as given at verse 14? "The Lord repented," &c. Yes, confusion there may be; but it is not in the narrative. *There* all is distinct—"Let Me alone . . . that I may consume them; and I will make of thee a great nation." This was the first word. The thing speaks for itself, and the meaning is that the sword is now this moment stretched out, with the *design that the stroke fall at once.* This it is that Moses deprecates, and in this he succeeds. "Jehovah repented of the evil which He thought to do to His people." Here again we find the strictest accuracy, and that is always a gain to us. The expression is not really 'thought to do,' but '*spoke of doing*,' *i.e., letting the stroke fall at once. Here it is that the reprieve has been granted, and here only.* All else is still in abeyance. Hence Moses, understanding his own position better than we now may possibly do, says to the people, "Peradventure, I shall atone for your sin." So he begins with the heart-broken confession, "Oh, this people have sinned a great sin, and made them gods of gold!" This is all; and no more is wanted. Equally brief is the plea. It is more, in short, like a broken plea from a broken heart—"Yet now, if Thou wilt forgive their sin." That is all; imperfect grammar, but perfect utterance of overloaded nature. Of *forgiveness*, however, he *has had as yet no assurance.* And unable, as he feels, to extend the plea, there is another thing that presses still as heavily, and which nothing may hinder him from uttering—"If not, blot me, I pray Thee, out of Thy book which Thou hast written." The one meaning is, 'If so be that Thou wilt not forgive, but must consume them after all, then I pray Thee, spare not me to live after them, or instead of them, as Thy word was. This, Lord, I cannot bear. If they are to be cut off, let me share the stroke.' He has suc-

ceeded now. "Jehovah said to Moses, Whosoever hath sinned against Me, him will I blot out of My book. Therefore now go, lead the people to the place of which I have spoken to thee."

What shall we now say of any supposed confusion or discrepancy, as pointing to a double authorship in regard to these last two interviews on the mount? We can only say that the harmony is perfect. There seemed perhaps a danger that some of the elements might clash. But now we can see them all together as making up one web of exquisite symmetry. And with matters so extremely delicate to balance and combine, we must profess an utter incapacity of conceiving how they all got where they now are by any hand of man but of Moses only, as actor and narrator. We might even venture to propose the present portion as a test case of the character of the narrative. And our conviction is the strongest possible, that such a return to the old paths of historical inquiry would leave little room for the newer methods introduced of solving difficulties, where there are none to be solved; or we may say of making difficulties, and leaving them unsolved.

We are much inclined, after this survey, to think of this portion of the narrative as what may be called *The Tragedy of Moses.* Now if it wanted one genius to give us the tragedy of Prometheus, another of Oedipus, and a still greater of Hamlet, what, we may well ask, was the genius that composed this of Moses? If the question provoke the mirth of any, that will only show their inadequate conception of the story in a human point of view. For, with its sudden evolutions and revelations of character, its multifarious and entangled incidents, its agonizing experiences and appalling inflictions, its ruin rushing at lightning speed, but stopped by the way, its splendid visions of glory declined by humility, its unparalleled transactions with God and man, and much besides; it surely forms a tragedy of no common order. These other tragedies, human genius conceived them, and out of materials gathered

from within or without compacted them. The process we know well. But now, what genius either originated or organized this tragedy of Moses? For surely, besides these, it occupies no second place. And an adequate origin it must have had. Where then, and what, was that? It is a question that both literature and 'criticism' are bound to answer. And what possible answer is there but this—*The genius was Truth?* In no other mint was the tragedy coined. By no other hand was it put forth. Theoretically taken, as an ideal construction, it wants an author of the same class, and I would say still more gifted than for the tragedies named. But taken, as it stands, apart from theory, genius cannot touch it. It is beyond that as the other side of the ocean exceeds our grasp. It declines all thought of genius as that ocean declines any attempt to compass it. And only one explanation can it listen to—'It is all Fact.' Then all becomes plain, and reasonable, and impressive, and edifying—all is then agreeable alike to the human and the Divine within us.

Or it may be put briefly thus. The matter of the golden calf furnishes a most real tragedy. This appears, whether we regard it in the deep principles involved, or the overmastering passions evoked; it appears in its incipiency, development, uncertainties, and crisis. Nothing is wanting, in short, to make a full, deep-toned tragedy. But a tragedy is either in fact or in idea. Now the tragedy of idea is the creature of genius. And of genius there is no trace here, nor of its possibility, if it were required. Besides, it is no common genius that could meet this case. The only conclusion is, that the tragedy is one of fact, and that its author is *Truth;* and this is as clearly present all through as genius is absent. And if genius has no place here, what room is there for any of the other authorships?

Sequel to the Golden Calf.

It is clear that an event like this must have had results. They were necessary as correlates to it. Hence, without being once obtruded, they are clearly traceable; and thus the event and its results are mutually corroborative. Now the results intimately affect the Divine action, and, of course, the spirit of Moses and the attitude of the people. And in this way we may explain various points which 'criticism' would draw objections from.

The first results are these. Moses, having succeeded in his short pleading (xxxii. 31–34), got his re-appointment as the people's leader to Canaan—this having been virtually in abeyance for a day. He is at the same time informed of the diminished honour to be bestowed on the company, "Behold, mine angel shall go before thee. Yet in the day of My visiting, I will visit upon them their sin." The words are neither so extremely simple, nor so studiously difficult, as a common fabulist would certainly have made them. One sentence more tells the general result of the great offence—"Jehovah plagued the people, because they made the calf which Aaron made." (*v.* 35.)

Chap. xxxiii.

Moses is now hastened back to the people with his new commission. (1–3.) "And when the people heard these evil tidings they mourned." It is very significant, in a merely critical point of view, that the *reception* of the tidings is thus assumed, without any formal notice of their *delivery*. "And no man did put on him his ornaments." Yes, they have been humbled, and repented. They are in a very different mind now from what they were on the feast-day. And how they came to be so is well explained, "For Jehovah said to Moses, Say to the children of Israel, Ye are a stiff-necked people. In one instant, should I [Jehovah, not the angel] come up into the midst of thee, I would consume thee. Wherefore now

put off thy ornaments from thee [*i.e.*, be your own natural selves] that I may know what to do with thee." And as they were commanded they did—putting off their ornaments *at* (rather *from*, *onward from*) the mount Horeb.

Then comes another sign of the dislocation that the great sin had occasioned in the people's relations with God. For (*v.* 7) "Moses took the tabernacle." (It is plainly a tent which had been serving for the time as a divine meeting-place on which the cloud rested.) He took it, "and pitched it *without the camp, afar off from the camp*, and called it *the tent of meeting*." "And whoever sought the Lord went to that." Moses at last —and it was well for them—obtained, for the time at least, from the thoroughly humbled people, the respect that was due to him. It is an extremely interesting picture (8–10), and important for us at present, as being full of details, all worthy of record, but not such as anyone would have made a fable of, nor yet such as would have been buried in a document, or could have been wafted along by tradition. One of these little details, and so truth-like, is, that Joshua had his permanent abode in that temporary tabernacle; while "with Moses Jehovah spake face to face, as a man speaketh with his friend." Wonderful condescension! And yet, if God is to stoop towards man at all, who shall say how much or how little He may properly assume of the likeness of the creature whom He made in His own image?

In illustration of this 'face-to-face' speaking, we have now an example of what passed between the man and his God on the all-important matter of the promised convoy. It strongly brings before us the want of that reassuring which Moses so keenly felt, after the terrible shock which had led to the breaking of the tables. This, by the way, furnishes a very delicate confirmation of the story of what Moses had undergone. Truly however it is face-to-face dealing that now takes place, and heart-to-heart also, let us venture to call it. But to be appreciated it must be pondered, and after much of that we

seem still much on the surface; but by such a record our God would surely try us whether we can distinguish between His very word and man's fables, or not (*vv.* 12–23).

Chapter xxxiv. This chapter continues the sequel—the strongly moral sequel—to the Golden Calf. Such a fearful blow to the relations of Israel and Jehovah called for a corresponding repair. Hence the return to the Mount for the renewal of the Tables—with another forty days' absence, which happily is patiently borne this time. This short statement (1–4) bristles as usual with specific facts which, when taken altogether, present a very strong evidence of historical truth. Then comes a fresh manifestation of Jehovah—as "merciful and gracious . . . keeping mercy for thousands," &c. (*vv.* 5, 6)—very wonderful, but very needful; for those who had so changed towards their God might well ask whether He had not changed towards them. It is one of the characteristics of this terrible Old Testament (as so many now regard it) that its most terrible denunciations are followed by enrapturing vistas of mercy. Thus, "Thou hast wearied Me with thy sins. . . . I, even I, am He that blotteth out thy transgressions, for Mine own sake."

In answer to the very humble confession and earnest prayer of Moses (*v.* 9) comes a *new covenanting* with renewed engagements of ultimate victory, and warnings for the promoting of that entire separation from all heathen ways, which was the very end of Israel's call, and on which their entire future would depend (*vv.* 21–17).

Shall we, after this, be stumbled by the repetition—we may say re-enactment—of the principal statutes for the festivals, even down to the prohibition of the seething of the kid? It has all one end, and takes its place to perfection, as a part of the *moral sequel.* Jehovah will be to Israel, in spite of their fears, all that He had engaged for. And the proof of Israel's accepting the engagement will be their faithful observance of the ordinances which are designed as the bond betwixt Him

and them. Hence, instead of the patchwork from document, tradition, fiction, and even fact, which Criticism so loves to speak of, we can very clearly see that it would have been the part of a merely mechanical editor far rather to shun, than indulge in such repetition. Hence the very strong presumption —with some it is absolute conviction—that these same matters appear in these different places simply because, as the writer assures us, they were communicated to him *as related.* Of this we have a clear example in regard to the last of the repeated directions (xxxv. 1–3) where the new circumstances are minutely given. Moses, having come down from the Mount, "gathered all the congregation, and said, These are the words which the Lord hath said that ye should do them"—repeating now the great Sabbath law, and after that the directions for the tabernacle which—so seriously interfered with by the late revolt—must be followed out now; for, after all that has happened, "Jehovah will still dwell among them."

The intervening passage (xxxiv. 29–35) about the shining of Moses' face—however much disallowed now—has all the characteristics of fact. And that so much should be said of such a matter, and yet so little—said too in so quiet a strain—this is not at all the style in which religious novels have been told—not excepting the ancient and eastern.

We close here with another look at the relation of those two chapters as the moral sequel of the preceding one. And there is more than that when we study it; for the three make up *nothing less than an integral portion of one organic whole.* It is one subject, one mind, one writer, just as it professes to be. Different times, different places, different authors find no room here. The moral unity is as complete as any honest criticism could ask for. The tragedy, with its black thunder, was appalling. Then set in the rainbow cloud. And then, in all its grandeur, shone forth the sky of the 'Covenant.'

Nor is this all. For the narrative of the 'Calf' depends entirely upon the statement as to Moses' long delay on the

mount. And that involves the fact of his ascent. And that, the matter of the Covenant and the Law, which were indissolubly linked with it, back to the Ten Commandments, now to be transferred to the stone tables. All this, and how much more, goes into the unity of the organic whole. Thus *Faith* has always believed it. And thus, as we can see, *Reason* need not be ashamed to accept it.

The Erection of the Tabernacle.

Chap. xxxv.–xl.

Moses, having already got his full orders on the Mount for all the materials and furniture of the Tabernacle, at last communicates the same to the people, the incense altar being now included with the other furniture. And this being over (xxxv. 4–19), there follows what seems extremely like a *fact* —"All the congregation of the children of Israel *departed from the presence of Moses*." (*v.* 20.) Then comes the hearty contribution of the people (21–29), with the formal notifying of the appointment of the architects (30–35). The work is now taken in hand, with special notices of certain life-like incidents interspersed (xxxvi. 1–8). These it would be hard to account for *except as real facts.* Thus verse 5, "They spake to Moses, saying, The people bring much more than enough." So the order was issued that the offerings should cease. "For the stuff they had was sufficient for all the work, and too much." (*vv.* 6, 7.)

The Furniture as made is now named. First the Ark, with Mercy-seat and Cherubim, the Table with its vessels, the Candlestick, the Incense Altar, with the Oil and Perfume, then the Brazen Altar and Laver (xxxvii. 1–xxxviii. 8). There is no formal adherence to the former order, and no sign of after-thought or separate source. One practice only seems strictly adhered to, and that is *repetition.* [This of course fixes the authority for the passage as P, such being his style. Only

it is forgotten that that style further consists in first giving the Divine directions, and *then* their execution in the same terms. But by this rule, here as elsewhere, nothing would be left of the material coming into P's hands for him to work upon; for those features which he is supposed to have stamped upon it constitute the whole of the case.] The Court with its hangings finishes the account, showing the exact amount of gold, silver, and brass employed for the house. Of these the silver calls for a special notice, for it was made up of the half-shekels of redemption money levied on the males over twenty years old, thus showing the number of these to have been 603,550 (xxxviii. 26).

Now it so happens that this is the very number brought out by the Census (Numbers i. 46), at least a month later. But, in so large a company, that interval should have made a difference. Hence the frequent inference that there are two authors here, one of them copying from the other—the result being that both the accounts cannot be genuine. And the explanation given, as the probable one, will be that the number, as said to be founded upon the silver, is only a guess, taken from the Census and comes near enough to the truth. We go beyond that, and say that the *equal numbers*, as given at that month's interval, are *exactly what they should be*, and instead of furnishing any ground for suspicion, distinctly enter into the harmony of the history. For what should have been the difference for the month? Of this we get an excellent test, by comparing the difference between the first Census in Numbers i. with the second in Numbers xxvi. 51, which amounted to 601,730. The difference between the two reckonings is 1828. And that divided among the lunar months of thirty-nine years will give about four for the average difference in the month. Why then, it may be said, not give this, or something like it, if perfect accuracy were designed? True, but *perfect accuracy was not designed;* for in that first census *no units are given under 50.* Hence the difference for the

month might have been ten times greater than the average, and *no notice would have been taken of it.* Thus, by our only means of reckoning, the two numbers, with the month between, *should have been, as they are, the same.*

If to the second census we now add a fair allowance for the Levites over twenty years of age, the average difference for the month will be increased, but will still fall greatly short of fifty.

It would be interesting to follow out to the last the unique narrative of the completion of the work (xxxix., xl.). But it is not necessary. And the thoughtful reader may possibly feel now, what so many have already felt, that the whole account comes home to our nature as only Divine truth can do. At last the people's preparations being completed and surveyed, and pronounced to be, "As the Lord had commanded," then "Moses blessed them" (xxxix. 43). If this is not written in entire truthfulness, it shows an unnatural amount of fraud.

It might seem then that, all being now in order for the erection of the Tabernacle, we should simply have had the notice of the work of erection. But it is not so. The Divine order for the setting up of each article must be given apart. So "the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, On the first day of the first month shalt thou set up the tabernacle" (xl. 2); which is followed by, "Thou shalt," "Thou shalt," "Thou shalt," as often as there is a single thing to be done (3–15). "Thus did Moses . . ." And the Tabernacle was reared up (16, 17). It might seem then as if this general statement were enough, and as if it might be assumed that each particular was done as directed. But no, Moses must again be introduced, in the very act of *executing each particular order* (18–33), and this is emphasized by the simple and solemn phrase, "As the Lord commanded Moses."

If, then, the whole took place successively as thus recorded, we have divine truth to deal with, and in that we find

life and dignity. We have, in short, a living limb growing on a living tree. If, however, instead of fact, we have only fiction, then for life we get death, for dignity meanness, and instead of a real branch we have only a piece of dead wood affixed to a tree, of what kind we know not. From the idea of various documents, or authors, or traditions, we shall get no relief. For it is not, let us well mark, that we have *two accounts of a single thing.* It is *the thing that is double.* And the accounts correspond. The two things are indeed as closely allied as two fingers in one hand. Still they are two, *and as such are* held up to us. Now the wonder is that they should be two, where, according to all common rules, they would have been thrown into one. But then the matter is far more specific, solemn, and momentous in its details than any human arrangement could be. And this is the justification of the method followed. It was the *matter* that deserved the *method*, not the style of P that gave rise to it. The *repetitions are too many for even that.* It is said of some things, that if not true they are well put. This, if not true, is remarkably ill put; if true, it is a living thing, and is not only worthy of being told, but is fit to edify men's souls, as it has often done, by an exhibition so graphic of *precept and practice* combined. If not true it is a dead thing, and the attempt to embalm it is despicable. To tell in a dignified style how the Lord commanded Moses in so many particulars, and then to tell in a corresponding style how he did exactly as commanded in one thing after another—this was of itself a thing far from common. For the repetitions with their exquisite simplicity are not those of one in want of something to say, but rather of a grand music fond of lingering over its theme and loath to leave it, the subject the same, but the tones ever new. Thus can we enter with our whole heart into the moving music of that grand refrain: "As the Lord commanded Moses. As the Lord commanded Moses."

After this view of the completion of the work we may take a step back and note the various repetitions in connection with it. First, in chapter xxv.–xxxi., Moses on the Mount gets the full directions for material and construction. These prefaced by "Jehovah spake unto Moses," and continued with "Thou shalt," "Thou shalt." In chapter xxxi. there is a break, with probably some little interval—Moses being still on the mount. Then again "Jehovah spake unto Moses," the design being to notify the appointment of the architect with a fresh mention of the things to be made by him.

None of all this is notified to the people in what would have been the regular course; for at his first descent from the mount the golden calf was the one thing to be thought of. On the second descent the old relations are re-established, and Moses now puts before the people the original prescriptions. (Chapter xxxv.) Next follows the work of Bezaleel, with a new recital of the articles made. (xxxvi.–xxxix.) And this is followed by the double reference to the work of erection, which we have just been considering. The least we can say of the whole is that each repetition has been expressly accounted for. Place, time, and circumstance varied. Giver and receiver have continued the same. To bring in various authors and various documents, to solve knots which all solve themselves, is as uncritical as it is undevout.

Nor do such repetitions as the present belong at all to the alleged style of P. They are too many, and too far apart, to meet that view, for that requires mere repetitions following close on the first statement; hence, besides the decisive argument that the whole is made up of the *features* alleged, leaving nothing to which to attach the features, it is incumbent on us to find some substantial, moral ground to go upon. And this we have just endeavoured to point out.

There is surely something then in this living transparency of action and incident beyond all rhetoric as well as all artifice.

It differs by a whole heaven from the critical frigidity, which would re-construct the history of Israel and re-write the books of Moses. Clearly enough, if these modern views be straight and the old records be crooked, light and darkness have changed place, in our day. Where we are now it would be hard to tell; but what next, impossible. Meanwhile we shall make bold to regard this book of Exodus as our blessed Lord regarded it, and that as a matter not of faith only, but of reason. In agreeing with Him we agree with One who is at once "the true Witness" and "the Light of the world," and security beyond this we cannot desire.

Conclusion.

(1) Thus far we have analysed what is now written in Exodus, as professedly being what "Jehovah spake unto Moses," and our conclusion is that, according to all known principles of evidence, the words were so *spoken*. Still the question is supposed to remain, Who *wrote* them? Now it is certainly not said, in so many words, that Moses did. And if that were said it would, in the present temper of 'criticism,' go for nothing. Moses is simply brought before us in the third person, as Cæsar in his *Commentaries*, and Xenophon the Athenian, in his *Anabasis*, relating the story of what they did. And as there was never the appearance of any but themselves being the narrators of their own deeds, the world at once accepted them as such. And precisely the same took place in regard to Moses.

(2) If these things were really spoken to Moses, what less could be designed than that he should take the most effectual means of communicating them permanently to his people? And what could that amount to less than his writing them?

(3) Is not Moses so manifestly engrossed with the

communications made to him that he never could rest till he had written them down?

(4) He does in fact write certain things, as we have seen. There is, for example, the affair with Amalek, which he is especially enjoined to write, as a matter which might not have seemed his work. There is the Covenant with its statutes and judgments which he is to write out at once and put before the people (xxi. 1, xxiv. 3, 4, 7); there is the Song by the sea, which is partially allowed to be his, and which was evidently meant for perpetuity. And there was the greater Song, which Moses not only spake to the people, but taught it, and also wrote out for them, and commanded that they should teach it to their children. (Deut. xxxii. 45, 46; xxxi. 22.) And if he did not write the Ten Commandments, that was because such was the work of Jehovah only. Again, if the Tabernacle structure was at first presented to the eye, it was surely meant that the pattern should be written out for the instruction of those who never could see that. Writing, in short, seems so natural to Moses that the neglect of it on the great occasion now in question seems altogether unnatural.

(5) If Moses did not write or dictate the words spoken to him, who did it? And what is gained by questioning that it was he? And so much of the most private and peculiar sort is mixed up with the words that he only knew it and could tell it.

(6) No man before Jesus ever came so near to being Jehovah's agent or mediator for man as Moses. And to think that after going so far and getting so much he neglected to use the means of perpetuating it is the extreme of unnaturalness. Hence we conclude that from the explicit way in which the communications were made to him—*and made to him as mediator*—it followed that he was to preserve them for the people, which he could do only by writing. This, therefore, we take as fully assumed by the present narrative.

To this we may add the case (to say nothing now of Deuteronomy) in which the third person is given up, and Moses stands before the people in the first, "Ye have sinned: and now I will go up to Jehovah; peradventure, I shall make atonement for your sin." (Chapter xxxii. 30.) This, though settling nothing about the writing, alters the view of Moses as only *spoken of*.

(7) We go a step further, and venture to draw an important plea from the book of Deuteronomy, for not only do we find there the *direct profession* and *every appearance* of the first part of the book being the word of Moses, but several of the 'critics' allow as much. Let us see then how, on the plains of Moab, he speaks of the Law *as already given*. And we may reflect as we go on how unaccountable such language would be from the pen of the supposed Deuteronomist of Josiah's day.

Chapter iv. 1. "Now therefore, O Israel, hearken to the statutes which I teach you . . . that ye may go in and possess the land which Jehovah giveth you." Here is the distinct statement, in the name of Moses, that the land has not yet been entered. If this be the word of any late writer it is what everywhere else is called a fraud, and a double fraud. This then, to begin with, looks like a word written, especially as certain of the "statutes and judgments" given by Moses were, as we have seen, written on the spot. (Exodus xxiv. 4.) Then follows verse 2, "Ye shall not add to the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish from it." Thus any late Deuteronomist would be setting himself in direct antagonism to Moses. The next is important. Verse 5, "Behold, *I have taught you* statutes and judgments, *even as the Lord my God commanded me*," &c.; verse 14, "The Lord commanded me at that time *to teach you statutes and judgments*." See how earnestly the same is pressed in chapter v. 1, "Hear, O Israel," &c.

Again (*v.* 31 and chapter vi. 1) Moses *gets* that he *may give*. And they, getting from him, "shall teach them diligently

to their children, and shall talk of them" at all times. And not only so, but "thou shalt bind them for a sign upon thine hand, and as frontlets between thine eyes. And *thou shalt write them upon the posts of thine house, and on thy gates.*" (*vv.* 7–9.) Could this be the first writing of these things? Could it be less than their *copying from the writing given them?* Yes, and when it was to be not an occasional thing, but a constant and universal practice. The same is repeated in xi. 18–20. And then verse 32, "Ye shall observe to do all the statutes and judgments *which I set before you this day.*" And to the same purpose xii. 1. Thus it is *Moses that professes* to give these statutes. And he does so before Canaan has been entered. Hence the statement is of extreme value, *if it be true.* And if not true, what of the pious Deuteronomist who thought thus to reform a darkened and corrupted people? All this strongly confirms us in the conclusion that Moses wrote Exodus. And it is indissolubly bound up with the words of Jesus, "If ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe My word?"

LEVITICUS.

HERE we have a perfect sequel to Exodus, a book cast altogether in the same mould, the only account of its origin being "Jehovah spake unto Moses." And the best guarantee for this—after our Lord's acceptance of it—is the perfectly Divine tone of the saying. It is for us an appeal, not to any external evidence, but to our truest, deepest, humanity. It is a constant declaration, with something like what seems to be the echo of a living voice continually repeating, "Jehovah spake unto Moses."

The strength then of our ground is this. The book purports to be, nearly altogether, *the direct word of Jehovah to Moses.* And except as such we cannot conceive of it. It is exactly in the style which that dispensation required in making provision for the worship of the peculiar people "until the fulness of the times should come." The whole is so perfectly novel and unique that we cannot imagine it to be anything but what it says of itself. As the contrivance of Moses or any band of priests we have no power of regarding it. Besides the fact that no breath of the sort has arisen anywhere, the unity, ease, and authority of the arrangements precludes the idea; for when priests and rabbis, with even such a model before them, sit down to draw up their ceremonial codes, they soon shew what manner of men and workmen they are. Then it is what Rabbi Jonathan said, and what Rabbi Akiva imagined, but nothing in the least like "Jehovah spake unto

Moses." And the moral atmosphere differs as the air on the mountain top does from that at the bottom of the dungeon. What if it be that Jehovah intended that the whole—and now as much as then—should sound out His own voice, and hold forth his own stamp?

But the book is not only didactic, or prescriptive, it is dramatic as well. There is not only the living voice of Jehovah, there is equally the living action of men. We have the exact date and spot to start from, and the live actors to go with us all through. Thus, among other realities, Aaron and his sons are brought on the stage again and again. And not only so, but two of these are introduced as doing what seemed extremely unlikely. They are actually presented as mocking God with a strange incense-fire—in the true spirit of the unbelief, which declares that the form is nothing when the heart is right, always forgetting that the wrong form may often prove the wrong heart. And so it was here. This sad incident is followed by one of another kind, at which Moses was both puzzled and angry. "For why," asked he, "had not the sin-offering been eaten by the priests?" seeing its blood had not been brought within the holy place. It is the question of the leader, and, according to the *letter* of the law, he was right. Aaron gives a practical answer, which, in his mind, overruled the letter on this occasion. "And Moses" (hearing it) "was content."

And not only is there this large amount of the prescriptive and the practical, there is a considerable proportion of special prophecy as well—prophecy as to the results of the obedience or disobedience of the people. The whole picture is of a kind that occurs only in the Bible. The prosperity of the obedient Israel is made to be as secure as the throne of God. Nothing in heaven or earth shall hurt them, while the retribution on the disobedient shall be as certain and appalling.

There is a remarkable instance of the fitting in of one wheel to another which must not be overlooked. It occurs in

chapters viii. ix., and seems not only a guarantee for Leviticus, but a living bond between it and Exodus. It is the case in which numerous directions had been already given for the treating of the priests. (Exodus xxxix.) When now "the Lord spake to Moses" these were, on this second occasion, repeated, and all was done "as the Lord commanded [*i.e.* had already commanded] Moses." It is extremely like what it professes to be—a certain man getting the original orders on the Mount, and then executing them when the time was come—both order and execution standing in their right relation.

If it be so, then, that "Jehovah spake to Moses" these things at the Tabernacle, there can be no reason for supposing that Moses did otherwise than write them as thus spoken to him.

Here we might leave the matter of the unity of Leviticus; but we must first notice some of the critical objections.

The first that occurs is this. (See *Driver*, p. 40.) "The second person in chapter ii. 4–16 (unlike the rest of these chapters) is noticeable, and *may be an indication that the chapter is formed out of a combination of elements originally distinct.*" Is it so, then, that the Divine speaker is denied that simple liberty of changing from the second person to the third, which any human being may take without a question? Is this the spirit and style in which Moses is to be criticised? But let us see. The second person in chapter ii. is not so very unlike "the rest of those chapters," as is thus intimated, for in i. 2 this very change has already appeared. "*If any man* of *you* bring an offering *ye* shall bring *your* offering. . . . If *his* offering be," &c And what an extraordinary procedure—just because of this colourless difference between the persons—to set by itself the introduction in third person (chapter ii. 1–3) and remit to another source the perfectly homogeneous continuation from verse 4 onwards, simply because of the entirely equivalent "*If thou bring.*" And then for a return

to the "*thou*"—said to be unlike the rest of those chapters—see vi. 27, "*Thou* shalt wash"; and of vii. 23–26, "*Ye shall eat.*" It may now be asked if, instead of this sharp search for incongruities, it would not be more reasonable to see here an evidence of the ease of true life, with some appearance of the reality of the fact that Moses was actually telling the people face to face what to do.

The next case will further illustrate the spirit in which these discordances are found out. It is the comparison of chapter iv. with Exodus xxix. 12, and Leviticus viii. 15. "It is not impossible" (it is said) "that Leviticus iv. may represent a more advanced stage in the growth of the sacrificial system than Exodus xxix. and Leviticus viii. 15. For here the blood of the sin-offering for the priest and the people, *i.e. the whole congregation*, is treated with special solemnity, being brought within the veil," &c. Now the fact is, it is no '*new stage*,' only a *different circumstance* in the old. For while in Exodus xxix. and Leviticus viii. it is simply the *consecration* of the *priest* that is on hand, here in Leviticus iv. it is a peculiar form of sin-offering for the removal of *special sin* (*v.* 22).

After this objection or raising of suspicions comes a reference to Numbers xv. 22–28, as showing a real divergence from the treatment of the congregation's sin in Leviticus iv. Now, instead of divergence, we see only the extreme minuteness with which conduct was inspected and sacrifice appointed. That the cases are not the same—even if not plain from the general tenor of them—would appear from the difference of sacrifice. Only a *kid* for a *sin-offering* being required in the second case.

The "criticisms" are continued thus. Attention is now asked to the *terms* of them. Thus vi. 19–23 was "*perhaps* not originally part of the collection"; vii. 22–27 "being *probably* placed here on account of the Peace-offering being accompanied by a sacrificial meal" (p. 41). In x. 10, "The connection with verse 9 is *imperfect*, the subject treated being

in reality a different one" (see xi. 47, and Ezekiel xliv. 23, with 21) "unless the margin of R.V. be adopted—which, though grammatically possible, is something artificial—it would almost seem as if x. 10 f. had been transplanted from its original context." And on grounds like these it would turn out that the Lord did *not* speak to Moses *as here related.*

Let us consider the objections. Why then should x. 10 be put with xi. 47? The *first* is concerned with holiness in *persons*, and *cleanness* only as that may affect the other. The *second* has to do properly with only the cleanness of animals—holiness coming in but indirectly after that. Hence, so far as this goes, x. 10 is perfectly in its place without any change in the rendering. And equally so it is when taken with its context. The order is, "Do not drink wine . . . lest ye die." Now this we see is appended to the account of Aaron's sons and their calamity. Whether *they* had been drinking wine or not, the danger of such a practice was always imminent. Hence nothing more perfect than the connection, "Do not drink wine . . . that ye may put difference between the holy and the unholy," &c. As for the reference to Ezekiel, that also is significant. For the sentiment is still the same, "Neither shall any priest drink wine . . . and they shall teach My people the difference between the holy and profane."

After this it is satisfactory to know that chapters xi.–xv. "occupy a thoroughly appropriate position." One would have hoped that if this meant that Jehovah really spake it all to Moses, some light might have been shed upon what precedes and follows. Meanwhile, as to the vitally important chapter xvi., we are left in the dark as to "whether it represents one and the same stage of ceremonial usage," and are requested to consult 'Benziger' on the subject.

All this however seems to be but light preliminary skirmishing against the integrity of the book which professes to be simply what "Jehovah spake unto Moses." There is now to be delivered the grand assault against the present position of

xvii.–xxvi. For "*this is certainly*" (we are told) "*from a distinct source.*" It is commonly spoken of indeed as "the Law of Holiness," and the author as H, instead of Kuenen's P, who employs also P^2 and P^3 for different strata of the *Priest's Code.*

Before however proceeding with this we must notice chapter xvii. 1–7.

Now this is said to be in conflict with Deut. xii. 15. For, while it forbids the killing of animals for food, away from the Tabernacle, Deuteronomy provides for it. Now supposing that the earlier prescription does really refer to the matter of food and not of sacrifice, there was a reason for the difference; for there was evidently a danger of idolatrous practices even in the matter of killing for food, to check which the present requirement is issued. The "open field" was regarded as the resort of demons; and the tendency was to leave for that not the Tabernacle only but the home. Hence this temporary provision against the danger. And so near were, now, all to the Tabernacle, that there could be no hardship in killing their food-animals there. But after settling in Canaan, the *same appearance* at the Sanctuary would manifestly be impossible; hence the relaxation in the order, so far as convenience imposed a change. Each requirement was the right one in its own place. What objection then can there be to either? Thus instead of anything contrary to *unity*, we have a clear view of *the one Moses* at the commencement, and then at the termination of the forty years—not first giving and then *repealing a law*, but simply giving two different regulations, each the fittest for its one occasion. And he does this with no fear of the critics before his eyes, only in the fear of God and the interest of Israel.

It thus appears that the prescription in Leviticus is issued on a particular spot and with a particular view, while the one in Deuteronomy has a direct reference to it as now to be altered. In all this we can see delicacies of adjustment not to

be reconciled with the piecemeal composition of the Pentateuch as supposed by the 'critics.'

The view of the section xvii.–xxvi., as given by Driver (pp. 43-45), may be thus summed up, "The section consists of a group of chapters which stand by themselves in P—differing from the main body of that by the presence of a foreign element, which shows itself *partly in the style, partly in the prominent motives.* The phenomena are explained by the supposition that an independent—and in all probability an older—body of priestly legislation lies at the basis of xvii.–xxvi., which has been incorporated in P. The elements thus united with P are distinguished from it *partly by the predominance of certain expressions*, never, or very rarely, found in P, or the Hexateuch generally; *partly by the predominance given to certain principles and motives.* The laws themselves have also, in certain instances, been provided with *a parenetic framework* in a manner unlike that of P. The principle which determines most conspicuously the character of the entire section is that of *Holiness*—partly ceremonial, partly moral—as a quality distinguishing Israel, and demanded by Jehovah (as chapters xix. 2; xx. 7, 8, 26; xxi. 6-8, 15, 23; xxii. 9, 16, 32). Holiness is a duty laid upon Israel in other parts of the Pentateuch; but while elsewhere it appears as one injunction among many, it is here insisted upon with an emphasis and frequency which constitutes it the leading motive of the entire section." Such are the premises, and the conclusion is set down as unquestionable. "These laws no doubt in substance, if not in form also, date in general from a much older time than that of the collector who brought them together, and settled them into their present framework." We note, in passing, how the first expressions, "*In all probability an older body*," have now become "*No doubt, much older.*"

The proof of all this is then given in a formidable list of twenty characteristic phrases, such as '*I am Jehovah;*' '*I*

Jehovah am holy;' 'I will set my face;' 'I will cut him off;' 'To walk in the statutes;' 'My statutes and judgments;' 'Observe, and do;' 'To profane the name of Jehovah;' 'My Sabbaths;' 'To bear the iniquity of;' and so on.

Here then is the case. This large section cannot be from P, but must be from some modification of the same who, on account of the subject chosen by him (Holiness), may be called H. But who is P? And who is H? It is *persons* we want, and these are only *ideas.* Suppose however the section cannot be from P. Well then we can do without him. But we cannot do without "*Jehovah spake unto Moses;*" and that, when we are told the very time and place where He did. And why not just believe it? Oh, because of the variety of style and thought! Variety from what? From P? Yes; but is it variety from Jehovah? For with whom should be more variety than with Him whose understanding is infinite? With whom is the fountain of all variety but with "Him who changeth not"? His works vary wonderfully. The light, the air, the water—these are continually changing their looks and their tones. The voice of the thunder and the voice of the zephyr differ—the look of the lightning, and the look of the sunset. But look, or voice, they are all equally His. So His creatures all vary. And the more so, the higher and better they are. One angel differs from another. Each differs from himself. And their looks and tones will differ accordingly. Shall we venture then to bind down Jehovah to one unvarying style, called P, or whatever else? His thoughts vary just as His actings in Nature, for He can be very gentleness, and He can be a consuming fire. He can be angry, and His anger can wax hotter and hotter. Why then may not His expressions also vary? If He can speak in manners so diverse by one prophet and another, why may He not speak variously by the chief of them all at different times? And now when it pleases Him to make a grand promulgation of a *holiness law*—and that just between two such stages in the revelation as the

appointment of the Great Atonement Day, and the outpouring of Blessing and Curse that is to come next—in both which matters His holiness comes out with a peculiar intensity —may He not, in such a case, repeat, in a deeper tone than ever, "I am Jehovah," "I, Jehovah, am holy"? And what more suitable when furnishing His people with their outfit for separation from the world than to speak of "My statutes and My judgments;" and how Israel is "to walk in them and do them;" or "He will set His face against them, and cut them off"? Is it out of place that such a One should speak of "*My Sabbaths*," and warn against "profaning the name of *Jehovah*"? And when could it be so appropriate as now to insist upon the cardinal principle of '*bearing sin*,' as what the bearer must be judged for? It was just this that men were so slow to learn, and so quick to forget. How extremely fit then to bring out here this vital truth with that peculiar energy which so became Jehovah! What, in short, is more perfectly like the voice to which it is ascribed? What less like the contrivance of any document maker? And as the word, to be a word at all, must have been spoken, and spoken on *some occasion*, what can be the gain of leaving that most suitable one here named, and launching out into that sea of uncertainty which all such speculations must involve? "Jehovah spake unto Moses;" *there* is the rock to moor our vessel to. Everything speaks for it, nothing against it. And thus instead of very nicely inquiring whether the same expressions do not occur elsewhere, it seems more reasonable to rest here—that "Jehovah spake unto Moses."

Before leaving this subject, we may notice that in the long list of peculiar phrases (under twenty heads) now commented on, there are two which, as apparently only naked expressions, might be taken beyond the others as indicating a distinction of authorship.

The first of the cases (No. 4) is "*ish, ish* (a man, a man), *as having the peculiar meaning* 'whoever.'" This, occurring in

the *Law of Holiness*, is held as distinguishing the special writer. The cases are ten—xvii. 3, 8, 10, 13; xviii. 6; xx. 2, 9; xxii. 4, 18; xxiv. 15.

Now it would take all value from this statement—even were it correct—that, as Dr. Driver gives it, there are three cases of the same *outside the portion in Leviticus*, viz., Lev. xv. 2; Numb. v. 12; ix. 10. To which we add three more—Exod. xxxvi. 4; Numb. iv. 19, 49. But this is of small consequence beside the fact that *in not one of the cases* does the phrase *ish, ish* mean *whoever*. It simply means *each* or *everyone*, according to a very common Hebrew method of *doubling a noun*. And *it is solely the addition of a relative phrase* that conveys the meaning '*whoever*.' Thus, in the first case—Lev. xvii. 3—"A man, a man (or everyone) *who* (asher) shall kill." So in the three other cases in chapter xvii.; also in xx. 2, 9; xxii. 18. In xviii. 6 there is no 'whoever' at all, only "a man and a man shall not approach," *i.e. no one shall approach*. In xxii. 4 there is another Hebrew form for the *relative*, "A man a man, *and he* a leper (*i.e. when he is*)." So xxiv. 15, "A man a man, *when*, if (*chi*) he shall curse." Thus in the ten cases *one* has no relative sense, simply '*no man shall*.' *Seven* have the full expression, 'each man, *who*.' *One* has 'each man, *when*.' And the *other* is, 'each man, *and he*' = who. Such a style of criticism could hardly have been expected from a Regius Professor of Hebrew. And yet it was thought good enough when the object was to drive a wedge into the Pentateuch. Can it be that the object blinded him to the means?

The other case (No. 12) is *amith*, a peculiar word for 'neighbour,' used seven times in this portion, and hence indicative, it is held, of a distinct author. Now this word should by its etymology express, as in Zech. xiii. 7, something more of the social element than the common word, as in the Tenth Commandment. And it should suffice to urge that no one can now say that Moses *did not mean to attach to the word*

something of its native sense. The Vulgate seems to have felt something of this kind by rendering twice by *frater*, and twice by *civis*. The seven cases are—xviii. 20; xix. 11, 15, 17; xxiv. 19; xxv. 14 (*bis*). And, after all, it is, as in the previous case, a question of numbers rather than of principle, for there are still three instances of the same word in the Pentateuch.

Such now is the grand assault to which the unity of Leviticus was to yield. Is it anything beyond a very loud and wide assertion?

There are still some minor matters calling for notice, as showing the style of objection now common. Thus, in regard to the 'sin-offering' matter in chapter x. 16–20, we are told that it amounts to a "law in narrative form" as a correction of the usage prescribed in ix. 15, 11. Now it is a serious thing to speak of Moses as correcting God's laws—which he of all men was least likely to do—when he was only meekly accepting Aaron's explanation of this very peculiar case.

Again, in chapter xviii. we are told, "It is *probable* that these laws were found already formulated by the compiler of *H.*, and that he merely provided them with the *parenetic* setting." *Probable*—how so? Because the laws are in the second singular, and the parenetic portions in the second plural! That is to say, the people *in general* are addressed, "Ye shall walk," "Ye shall keep," "Ye shall do." But when the horrible things not to be done are specialised it is thought best in delicacy to speak of them in the *singular*. Try the plan of forbidding each sin in the plural, and see the difference. It is only when the special horrors are got quit of that the plural is resumed, "*Ye* shall keep My statutes." Now this might have been taken as a delicate trait of unity—thus to vary for so proper a purpose.

In xxi. 1–15 another incongruity, we are told, appears; for although the priests were to be *addressed*, according to verse 1,

they are only spoken of in the *third person;* and the *people* are spoken to in the *second person*—verse 8. "Thou shalt sanctify him therefore." But is it not strictly true that the priests, and they only, are addressed down to verse 7? And if this be in the *indirect* form of the *third person*, is not such a style well understood and always allowed to adjust itself without the violent assumption of an incongruity requiring another authorship? And then, if in the midst of this real but somewhat indirect address to the priests, there is a word to be spoken—verse 8—of how the *people* are to treat them, what more natural than to turn to the people and tell them so? After which the address to the priests continues as before. It may now be asked whether this case, in adapting style to circumstance, is not more like the simplicity of a first hand than the awkwardness of a second?

NUMBERS.

IT is not needful to enter upon this so minutely as Leviticus. The ground is very similar as to the grand point, "Jehovah spake to Moses"—whether for institutions or necessary directions; while, as to narrative, the proportion is here larger. There is still of course the same disposition to make it out that the book is of a "composite character." And the style employed is this: "Chapter xi. appears to show marks of composition, although, as is often the case in J E., the data do not exist for separating, with confidence, the sources employed." "Chapter xii. belongs probably to E," and so on.

This brings us to chapter xiii., where the 'critical' method becomes very marked. The chapter reads, it is true, quite like a perfectly homogeneous piece. As to the business detailed, the authority is still "Jehovah spake unto Moses," which surely is in no way inconsistent with what seems to have been the prior fact of the people's suggesting the search of the land. Now this Moses would certainly put before the Lord, and having received the Divine order he at once sets about to execute it; himself lives in the scene, if narrative can show life; and to all appearance writes it out. But all this it seems is deceptive. It is not a single account by him, or by anyone. "*The double character of the narrative is very evident!*" That is to say, there are two parallel accounts pieced into our present one—the ideal authors being P and J E.

And here is the proof. (1). One of the accounts takes the spies only to Eshcol, while the other carries them to the extreme north of the land; as if it were not allowable to give such things in detail; and as if it were not immediately said, after the notice of Eshcol, "They returned from searching of the land after forty days."

(2). The two accounts of the spies' reports are discordant—one of these (27–31) representing the land as very fertile, but too hard to conquer; while the other speaks of it as "eating up its inhabitants"; as if that meant it was too poor to sustain them! Now it is strange if the compiler could so blunder as thus to weld into one, statements so incongruous as these would be. Does it not rather seem as if *even he* had taken the natural view, that the "eating up of the inhabitants" was a peculiar mortality, sent as a judgment to prepare for the new population?

From this we pass to a more important case—the treatment of the narrative of Korah and his company. (Chap. xvi.) "And here, according to Dr. Driver, two, if not three, narratives have been combined." (p. 59.) The two are J E and P. In the first of these the act, we are told, of Dathan and Abiram, Reubenites, is a rebellion against the civil authority of Moses. In P it is Korah, the Levite, who protests, with some of his own class, that "*all* the congregation is holy." "Again, the one account mentions only Dathan and Abiram; the other only Korah—the motives and aims of the malcontents being in each case different. We see also the inequality of the manner in which the three appear. In verse 1 they are represented as taking part in a common conspiracy, but afterwards they act separately. Thus Moses speaks to Korah without the others, and then to these without him. Again, Dathan and Abiram do not act in concert with Korah (16–22), but remain in their tents (26, 27); and their fate is different. In other words, Korah is united with the others, not in reality, but *only in the narrative.* He represents

different interests, and acts throughout independently of them."

The meaning of this then simply is that the account, as we have it, is not true. There was no one combined movement as related; but two separate movements, one of priests, one of laymen, written respectively by the two authorities on either side, P and J E. These, however correct separately, having come into an ignorant compiler's hands, have been mistakenly combined into one incorrect whole. And yet it is only in our day that this has been discovered!

Now the best way to settle this matter is just to consider carefully what the Bible narrative says. Plainly, then, it is a tremendous effort that is made to crush Moses. And our critic, while arguing for a perfect independence between Korah and the other two, admits, as he must, after *vv.* 1–3, that the conspiracy "*began with the three.*" But to admit this is to admit all, for here we have the whole fact of the combination, and no subsequent proceedings can affect that. Now the ground of the original design is plain. It is no part of *Reubenites* to start a rebellion against Moses for the reason alleged that '*all the congregation is holy.*' But it was exactly the position that they would assume when relying on the co-operation of *Levites.* Again, it could be no object with Levites to stir up such a body of laymen to a rivalry with themselves. But it would exactly suit them to inflame those princes with the idea of independent dignity, waiting for a crisis when they, as priests, would get their own place in the plot. Consistency of principle is not for a moment to be looked for here. It is pride and passion, not principle, that is in the ascendant now. And enough, if a fair commencement of the desperate struggle be made on so plausible a ground as the universal holiness of the congregation. It is the best beginning that can be made. All other details will arrange themselves in time. And if it turn out that the measures of Moses shall nip the whole in the bud

—so as even to prevent any further meeting of the conspirators —that will in no way affect the original design. Meanwhile, the conspiracy is deep and wide. The Levitical power, and a large portion of the nation power, have coalesced; and the restless, godless people, chafing against Moses for the disaster at Hormah, and just set adrift by him for their wilderness wanderings, seek satisfaction, by means of an entire revolution, religious or national. Nothing less will suit them, and in this they are wise. What, then, has Moses to look to, but God only? Except for Him, all is gone. But this Moses knew, that he was on God's side, and God on his.

Going back now to verse 1, beginning with the word '*took*,' it should not be doubted that it describes the act of Korah, the Levite, in *taking* those Reubenites into league with himself. So the three, with whoever besides, rose up against Moses, with the "250 famous princes of the people." The very sight was enough to crush any man with less than God for his strength. And how completely the rival elements, priestly and secular, had amalgamated appears at once in the well-framed charge, "Ye take too much upon you; all the congregation is holy." Thus the priests let themselves down to fraternize with the multitude; while these take advantage of the act to mount on the shoulders of the priests. It is a humble compromise on the part of Korah thus to merge himself in the promiscuous crowd. And it is a bold assumption for the other side to aspire to a dignity to which it had no title. It is the most perfect device possible for the ruin of Moses, unpopular as he was at that moment. So he speaks first to his God, and then to Korah and his company. For at this stage their only hope was in united action; and the word is this, "To-morrow the Lord will show who are His, and who are holy."

So much for that first day, and it is enough. Dathan and Abiram seeing there is to be a Divine testing of their pretensions, stand aloof, and leave Moses to announce the test to the others. (6–11.) Since, however, they have declined to appear

Moses sends to call them, and receiving an insolent reply, continues addressing himself to Korah and his company, when the challenge is given to all those proud pretenders to holiness to present themselves together with Aaron. Dathan and Abiram are then sought for by Moses in person, but to no purpose. The judgment is now announced, and the people warned to keep away from the rebels. Then the earth opens, and swallows up all who, in defiance of the warning, clung to them; while, as to the 250 with their censers, "a fire came from Jehovah, and consumed them." It may now be judged whether the three who conspired together at the first had not good reason for acting independently afterwards.

We may now see in this a perfect life-drama, with no element awanting of plot, principle, or passion. It is short and changeful like a sudden thunderstorm, and as decisive. Now our strong conviction is, that any criticism—which ignores all these features of the story, and attempts to resolve it into certain incongruous elements by some new analytic method—is equally false to nature and to art. Call it literature if you will, and a grand step in the march of light. Wonder not if to others it is only fantastical, and a melancholy harbinger of a darkness which, if not stopped, can land us only in midnight.

Balaam.

Chap. xxii.–xxiv.

This, as might be expected, is treated as the work of J and E. Let us see on what grounds. "Chap. xxii. 2–41 may be assigned with some confidence to E except *vv.* 22–35; observe *Elohim* almost uniformly, not *Jehovah.*" But why 'almost uniformly,' when from *v.* 2 to 21 we have *Jehovah* 3 times against the 4 of *Elohim*, while, in *v.* 18, we have *Jehovah my God?* Then in *v.* 22, the *Jehovist* begins with *Elohim*, as in *v.* 8, the *Elohist* with *Jehovah!* Thus the *names* shift their

places from one compiler to another without a word of explanation. And yet this, when sought, clearly appears in the variety of thought. Let us look well into it.

"Lodge here this night (*v.* 8), and I will bring you word as *Jehovah* shall speak to me." Balaam will make the most of it; *that* suits him well. It is no less than *Jehovah*, the God of Israel, of whom he talks, and this the messengers shall know at once. But commencing thus, why should not E keep up the same style? Or why, let us say, begin by this notorious departure from his own style? For at once the narrator, leaving Balaam's 'Jehovah,' relates that "*Elohim* came to Balaam." And why *Elohim?* Because it was enough—enough for the truth, and enough for the narrator—that the '*Divine Being*' came. 'Jehovah' might better suit Balaam, and so he is left with that. Yes, and Balaam himself finds some reason or other for a change of style. Something has signified to him that *Jehovah* is not so near as he presumed. So now, "Balaam said to *Elohim*" (*v.* 10); and then "*Elohim* said to Balaam." (*v.* 12.) For 'Jehovah' has not responded to Balaam's liberty. But observe, this does not move Balaam from his standing before the messengers; so he returns to his dignity, '*Jehovah* refuseth to give me leave to go. (*v.* 13.) Another embassy follows, and the answer now is, "I cannot go beyond the word of *Jehovah my God.*" Here we have the whole of it; *Jehovah* is Balaam's *Elohim;* and his next thought is to revert to his first position, "Stay, that I may know what *Jehovah* will say to me more." (*v.* 19.) Here Balaam maintains his assumption, and Elohim maintains his dignity ('Jehovah' still keeping in the background); for, as before, '*Elohim*' came to Balaam (*v.* 20), and "*Elohim's* anger was kindled." (*v.* 22.) But now the view alters—"The angel of *Jehovah* stood in the way." For such a *spectacle* being now needful, that was the only possible form for it. "And the ass saw the angel of *Jehovah.*" (*v.* 23.) And now something extremely notable, after four appearances of this sort, "*Jehovah* opened the mouth of the ass." (*v.* 28.) Yes, *Jehovah* Himself,

who had repelled Balaam's presumption, till at last the *same* "*Jehovah* opened the eyes of Balaam," and then he saw "the angel of Jehovah standing in the way." And now *He* it is who deals with Balaam, and charges him to speak only what *He* bids him. (31–35.) At last Balaam is before Balak, but though more fawned upon than ever, his own bearing is decidedly humbler than at the first; for he contents himself with, "The word that *Elohim* putteth into my mouth, that shall I speak." This was the proper name now.

Now there seems in all this something deeper than authorship, and more exact than the "almost uniformity" that we were just told about. For the want of the uniformity in words just springs from the uniformity in principle. And here comes a question, more easily asked than answered, How did it come that any breath of tradition ever carried down such a story with all its delicate adjustments for the course of some 600 years, till caught up and fixed for posterity by the diligent E? And now we, the more confident, from this very chapter, that the true E, as well as the J, is just the real Moses himself, can admire and enjoy those marks of the truly Divine in the very delicate, significant, and harmonious employment of the two great names.

The next objection is decidedly feeble. "In verse 21 Balaam goes with the princes of Moab; in verse 22 (by J) he is evidently alone." As if these could not still be in the company *without its being repeated*, and as if the repetition by J himself in verse 35 did not serve all the purpose. "The angel of Jehovah said, *Go with the men.*" This repetition, however, has, we are told, its use. It is made to serve the purpose of picking up the thread of E's narrative, which after verse 21 had been broken off for J.

And yet observe, if the absence of repetition, really needless, was an offence against the unity of the narrative, another offence is the presence of a repetition which is counted needless. Thus verse 2, "Balak, the son of Zippor, is superfluous before

verse 4. Balak, the son of Zippor, was king," &c. So verses 3 and 5 are different statements of the same fact. Hence the idea that the different statements required different authors. How many authors, at this rate, must have been wanted for all Jeremiah's repetitions of "Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon"?

In regard to the other two chapters the notice is of much significance. "It is uncertain whether 23 and 24 belong to J or E, or whether they are the work of the compiler who has made use of both sources. Critics differ, and it is wisest to leave the question undetermined" (DRIVER, p. 62). Thus the only thing certain about this portion is that it is *not the work of a single author;* but what belongs to any one is not clear.

And this certainly is not to be wondered at, for so interwoven and interchanged are the Divine names that it must be hard to say where the division comes in on which the 'composite' depends. Thus in xxiii. 8, "How shall I curse whom *Elohim* hath not cursed? or how shall I defy whom *Jehovah* hath not defied?" it seems as difficult, taking the lowest view, to divide this between two authors as to divide any parallelisms in Hebrew poetry. And yet there is more than this, for it is evidently the mind of Balaam to fill up with the strongest views possible his unanswerable questions. And this he could best do by representing first the vanity of contending with *Elohim* and then with *Jehovah*. No wonder that the critics were brought to a stand in the face of sentences like this, for such diversity of *sentiment* did not come within their range. And then there was all the peculiarity in Balaam's case, with his knowledge so abundant, and his presumption equal to it, while yet there was the Divine eye watching, and the Divine hand controlling every movement, till he was little able to carry out his own ideas. And even Balak has to choose his phrases, so as to help on his dealings with Balaam. It is 'Elohim'—naturally of course—with him, and yet he is forced sometimes into the 'Jehovah' idea, so as to meet the prophet. In the record, on the other hand, of

the Divine action towards Balaam, it is in these two chapters, as in the previous one, *Jehovah* that *gives him the word.* And still it is '*Elohim*' (as the name for the Supreme Being, *God not man*) that is employed several times as at once sufficient and more suitable. And thus these two men were under influences which obliged them to choose their expressions, and this they did in such a way as no 'criticism' can account for. It is only the variety of attitude in which their human nature finds itself that can account for it. And that is a matter which does not come within the range of the 'criticism' in its eagerness to make out where E ends and J begins.

We notice one objection more to *Numbers* from the account in chapter xxxi. of the spoils from Midian, as numbering among other things 675,000 sheep. Now it is not easy to calculate the number that might be thus taken from such a region. And we should allow for our ignorance as to who were in alliance with Midian. Hence we are shut out from any independent conclusion, but we have a fact or two which will help us. Thus we know that the *yearly tribute* of the king of Moab to the king of Judah was at one time 200,000 animals from the flock. (2 Kings iii. 4.) And in the Reubenite expedition against the Hagarites (2 Chron. v. 21) there were carried off 250,000 sheep. The numbers in our chapter would not ill agree with such facts. If, of course, any circumstance thus related is simply *impossible* then it can easily be dealt with on its own ground.

DEUTERONOMY.

ACCORDING to the 'critical' view this book of Deuteronomy was written from sources to be noticed afterwards by an unknown writer before, or during, Josiah's reign, about 620 B.C. And it was this, as deposited, and afterwards found in the temple by Hilkiah, that was supposed to be the book of Deuteronomy by Moses. Now in the book itself, by whomsoever written, there occurs this, that the future king "shall write him a copy of this law in a book out of that which is before the priests the Levites: and it shall be with him, and he shall read therein all the days of his life." (Deut. xvii. 18.) If Moses, then, wrote this it wants no explanation. But if the Deuteronomist, it does. And, as he is supposed to have written everything with a pure—not to say high—motive, we are obliged to ask if he did this to foster the important belief — as being essential to his whole scheme — that such a book, although non-existent before, had really been lost and was at last found. Now, whatever we may think of the supposed *motive*, we have one circumstance, to begin with, which comports badly with this theory of the book. It is the fact as related in 2 Kings xi. 12, that when they crowned Joash, though only a child of six, in 878 B.C., "*they gave him the testimony*," which we can hardly separate from the Deuteronomic requirement just quoted.

The same use of written law had clearly been made by Hezekiah. For all his multifarious arrangements were

"*according to the law of Moses, the man of God.*" (2 Chron. xxx. 16.) And as for those who "did eat the passover *otherwise than it was written*" "Hezekiah prayed, May the good Lord pardon everyone." (*vv.* 19, 20.)

The next notice of written law is during Josiah's cleansing and repairing of the temple when Hilkiah "found the book of the law of the Lord by the hand of Moses." (2 Chron. xxxiv. 14.) He seems to have recognised it at once, and instead of questioning with Shaphan, simply declares the fact, and delivers to him the book. In the same spirit Shaphan receives the book, carries it to the king, and reads it before him. With the same unquestioning confidence the king accepts it, and the whole company of priests, scribes, and prophets—Huldah expressly and Jeremiah virtually. No one doubts that it is an actual finding of an actually lost book, actually written by Moses. What follows is the confession, "Our fathers have not kept the word of the Lord to do after all that is *written in this book.*" And then Huldah, "Thus saith Jehovah, I will bring evil upon this place, even all the curses written in the book which they have read before the king of Judah." And then comes a passover, such as had not been since the days of Samuel, and all, in consequence of the discovery, because "according to the ordinance," and "as written in the book of Moses." So perfect was the conviction, and so bound up with notorious facts, that the book now found was a real recovery of the lost book of Moses. And yet this, we are told, was no fact, but only the fancy of the people, and the pious fiction of the man who had so religiously slipped his new production into the corner where Hilkiah found it. And this man, so long unthought of, is now the wonderful Deuteronomist. "For even though it were clear" (we are told) "that the four books of the Pentateuch were written by Moses, it would be difficult—or rather impossible—to sustain the Mosaic authorship of Deuteronomy." (Driver, p. 77.) "The book bears the marks of being the work of a single

writer, who has taken as the basis of his discourses, partly the narrative and law of J E, as in the previous books, and partly laws derived from other sources." (*ibid.*, p. 66.) "It must have been written prior to the 18th of Josiah. How much earlier than this it is difficult to determine." (*ibid.*, p. 81.)

Such is the new theory on the subject. Before proceeding further with it we notice that it assumes two things equally inadmissible.

1. *That no book had been lost at all*—the one now produced being a new production. How, then, account for the discovery as asserted, and the universal belief which it evoked? And what, in that case, could be the pretence for producing such a book? If it be imagined that it may have been another section of the Mosaic legislation that was lost—we say, No, for the large section called the 'Priest's Code' (P) had not yet appeared; and the remainder consists entirely of J E, unless it be the imaginary *Law of Holiness* in Lev. xvii.–xxvi. But J E was not lost, for it is the very part on which this Deuteronomy is supposed to have been founded. Hence it was well known to the writer of that; and if to him, then certainly to others also. *It* certainly was not the lost book. And if so, it is lost till this day, and could never—considering the general acquaintance with it—have been accepted as the thing recovered when the new Deuteronomy was produced.

2. Coming next to the alleged production of the book, it is impossible that it could have been made up simply from J E, even when eked out from the other unknown sources hinted at. It would have required at least the whole of the preceding books to give the competent acquaintance with Moses. And even that would have been all too little for the perfect portraiture now presented to us.

II. What the Book says for Itself.

The chief view is this, that Moses stands before us from the very first, acting and speaking as no other could do. For this

he had received directions beforehand, the Lord having already said to him, on the Moab plains, "Speak to the children of Israel, When ye are passed over Jordan, Ye shall drive out the inhabitants of the land," &c. (Numb. xxxiii. 50–56). Hence he is only following out that order now—in doing which he first tells us in minute geographical terms *where* it was that he spoke, and also *when*—to the year, month, and day (Deut. i. 3). Now this, from the supposed writer, could not be other than a novel. One mistake, indeed, this writer is supposed to have made by looking from his own Judæan standpoint, and so making Moses speak as being "*on this side Jordan in the wilderness.*"*

Now we cannot suspect of mistake here a new Moses any more than the old one. Either of them would know perfectly where the plains of Moab lay; and used no doubt the term current from Abraham's time when the *Eastern side* came to be called *beyond Jordan*—an expression which would naturally continue.

The narrative commences, and mark the terms, "Beyond Jordan, in the land of Moab, *began* Moses to declare this law, saying." And then he travels back, for the sake of reminding the people of the original introduction to the journeying orders, "Jehovah spake to us in Horeb, Ye have dwelt long enough in this mount. Turn you, and take your journey," &c. All so affecting to Moses as affording the prospect, now sadly withdrawn, of seeing "the good land and Lebanon" (6–8). Then he reminds them of how he had at the same time urged upon them his need of help, and how they had assented (12–17). And how, at Kadesh-barnea, they had proposed to send men to search the land—a proposal which, would certainly be laid before the Lord, and which, as

* The meaning certainly is, as in R. V., 'beyond.' The A. V. must have been trying to save the geography of Moses when rendering '*on this side*!' See for the same usage, chap. iv. 41, where 'across Jordan' (not '*this side*') is followed by toward the *sun-rising*.

we know, He graciously accepted (*vv.* 22, &c.).* Then the search with the issue, and the murmuring, and the pleading for the murmurers, are all minutely detailed; till at last, when the cause was lost for that generation, he so tenderly told them in words, not previously given, "Your little ones, which ye said should be a prey . . . to them will I give it" (*v.* 39). Then the final rejection of the renewed petition (41–45). Upon which "We turned and took our journey," &c. (ii. 1). Now this, if history, was either by Moses, or close upon his time. Otherwise it is a novel. Next comes the command to go through Esau's people; "*and they will be afraid of you;*"—a genuine contemporaneous stamp, surely; then certain antiquarian notices—quite foreign to a recent writer, "The Emims dwelt therein in times past"—yes, "The Moabites call them Emims" (10–12). Now "rise up, and get you over the brook Zered." So to the end we get notices equally minute, with similar antiquarian notes about the Horims, Avims, Caphtorims, and Zam-zummims. And here we observe a singular freedom in the intermingling of the "I, Jehovah," with the "I, Moses" (25, 26)—showing how perfectly the writer was at home in all this—till he actually comes to say, "*I* gave this land;" "*I* gave Gilead," &c. (13–16). "*I* gave to the Reubenites and Gadites," with this parenthesis so wonderfully life-like, "*For I know that ye have much cattle.*"

He then tells how, after the original sentence of exclusion from Canaan, he had still longed to enter, and ventured to plead for it, till plainly told, "Speak no more to me of this matter" (iii. 26). Now this petition is not alluded to in Numbers xx. 12, where the exclusion is related. And yet the rejection of it had sunk so deeply into the mind of Moses that he again refers to it in the most affecting terms (xxxii. 48–52; *cf.* xxxiv. 4). And as it is clear that the Deuteronomist did

* It will be seen that, taken thus, there is no sort of incongruity between the statement here and Numb. xiii. 1, &c.

not get this reference to the *petition* from any J. E., the question is, Where did he get it? Shall we say he took his legitimate liberty of imagining it? But surely we cannot allow him to be always imagining, and yet always declaring that 'Moses said' so. See chap. i. 1, 3, 7, 8, 20, with all the antiquarian notices in chap. ii., and cases far too many for notice, where Moses tells here, for the first time, what no man writing history could possibly imagine from the previous account. All these references to the past, in short—as unwritten before—have in them a freedom as to fact, and a freshness of life, which it was impossible for any late writer to have assumed.

The narrative being ended for the present, there comes next that charge of extraordinary power in chap. iv. which has been regarded hitherto as the living effusion of the Moses' heart, through the Moses' mouth, but is now taken as merely the ascription to Moses of words which he might with propriety have spoken. "Now therefore hearken, O Israel," &c.—all being still intermixed with notices of incidents that fitted the exhortations, as, *e.g.*, what "He declared to you," what "He commanded me. . . . But I must die in this land." Then the same prophetic tone (25–31) as in chap. xxviii.—the living Moses being all the time face to face with the living people—"Ask now of the days that are past," &c. So at the close of the charge, when some important matters had been settled, the introduction is virtually repeated, "These are the testimonies, and the statutes, and the judgments which Moses spake to the children of Israel, after they came forth out of Egypt."

For seven chapters more is the same style of address continued. To give further particulars in proof of its perfect genuineness would be tedious. But every line should be considered. Now it is expressly written—written by the Deuteronomist, whoever that may be, Moses himself, or another—that Moses was the man who *said* and *did* all this.

It is not told indeed that he also *wrote* it. That is the second question. The first is, Who *spoke* it? And the actual speaker is the actual author of Deuteronomy, just as any man is the author of his own speech—whoever may be the writer. So deceptive is the sentiment that "The true author of the book is he who introduced Moses as speaking in the third person." He would be only the publisher of the book—a book which is an actual autobiography of him who spoke it.

And yet it is, after all, only partially true that the writer of the book is not mentioned, for the notices of Mosaic writing are as distinct as could be desired. Thus chap. xxxi. 9–13, 19–22, 24–26, "Moses wrote this law, and delivered it to the priests . . . so that it might be read every seven years," &c. *Cf.* xvii. 18, 19, where the king is commanded to write a copy from the priests' book, "and he shall read therein all the days of his life." We must also remember the many cases in which the expressions used of the 'statutes and judgments' can hardly involve less than that they were given in a written form, such as, "Thou shalt teach them diligently to thy children," &c. "Thou shalt bind them for a sign upon thine hand;" "Thou shalt write them upon the posts of thine house." And "In time to come, the children will ask, What mean the testimonies, and statutes?" &c. (ch. vi. 7–9, 20). Enough to add a very simple thought as sufficient to settle many a question. If Moses did not write what he *spoke, Who did? Who could?* Our conclusion is, then, that it required one who had lived through the scene to give us this living transcript of it—that such transcript was impossible in the seventh century—that no compilation of any age could have put on this life; and that, in short, there is no accounting for the entire facts, but that Moses was the living writer who told of Moses the living actor.

By way of apology for the Deuteronomist, in thus ascribing to Moses a speech of his own, we are told that "this freedom is characteristic of ancient historians generally, and was

certainly followed by the Hebrew historians" (Canon Driver, p. 84). Now it must be a weak cause which requires such support. It is true that the ancient historians, in relating men's actions, do take the liberty of making them say—as Thucydides allows to be his principle, when only partially informed—"What seemed most opportune."* And thus Alcibiades, Nicias, Brasidas, and the rest, get the benefit of the historian's oratory. But no historian would take matter, words, and all, and put these into anyone's mouth as his autobiography. That was the work of the poet, like Homer, with his *Ulysses*. Herodotus, with all his license, never coined speeches at that rate. If he must make Themistocles say at Salamis more than he did say, still there was a Salamis, with all its stern reality, and a true speaking and acting *as reported*. We are not left to say, 'Perhaps there was such a battle, and probably the Persian fleet was shattered on the occasion; and there may have been traditions, or even notes, from which Herodotus borrowed. But it is impossible to say positively.' And yet this is how Moses and the great discourse on the plains of Moab are treated!

As to the classical being also the Biblical style of narration, the only way, we suspect, of reaching this conclusion is just to assume it. Thus, in regard to Judah's speech in Gen. xliv., the critical view amounts to this, that not Judah, but J (Jehovist) is its author. Give us, we say, on the other hand, an actual Judah, pouring out his soul with every possible stimulus to feeling, rather than some impersonality, 800 years afterwards, with no feeling in the matter. It is circumstances that make speeches, and this is equally true with Judah or Moses.

* "At the same time I have adhered (says he) as closely as possible to the general sense of what was actually said." Could the Deuteronomist have said as much in writing what, as far as he knew, was never said at all? And let it be remembered that the state of society in which this practice originated was the contrast of the Hebrew.

After this view of the writing by Moses in Deuteronomy xxxi. 24–26 and Exodus xxiv. 2–8, let us add what follows after the death of Moses, "*This book of the law* [says the Lord to Joshua] shall not depart out of thy mouth, but thou shalt meditate therein, day and night, that thou mayest observe to do *all that is written therein.*"

So the quotation in Joshua viii. 31 is directly taken from Deuteronomy xxvii. 5, 6, as appears from "the whole stones," and the "lifting up of iron." And naturally so: for while Exodus xx. 25 only dealt with the altar in general, Deuteronomy and Joshua were dealing with the altar at Ebal. The entire transaction there, in fact, is based upon Deuteronomy alone, xi. 29; xxvii. 3, where it is said, "Thou shalt write upon them [mark, on the *terra-cotta* tablets] all the words of this law. . . . Thou shalt write upon the stones all the words of this law very plainly." (*v.* 8.) The fulfilment being in Joshua viii. 32, 39, "And he wrote there upon the stones a copy of the law of Moses, in the presence of the children of Israel." Then, after the transaction at Ebal, "He read all the words of the law, the blessings and the cursings, according to all that is written in the book of the law. There was not a word of all that Moses commanded, which Joshua read not before all the congregation of Israel, with the women, and the little ones, and the strangers that were conversant among them." (*vv.* 34, 35.) We need not ask how this is to be reconciled with the first appearance of Deuteronomy, under Josiah.

To sum up the case, so far as we have gone, we say this book professes to be, without a break, the spoken word of Moses, as his last address to Israel—which makes it a spoken autobiography, whoever the publisher.

The critical theory, on the other hand, attributes it all to the Deuteronomist, as making it up and giving it out *in the name of Moses.* Hence we need not wonder at the intimacy which he professes to have with his hero, nor the boldness of speech which he assumes in personating him. All *that* belongs to the

plot. And the more of it, the more of the Moses-like it exhibits. But then, instead of history, this amounts to novel only. Now, as to the *morality* of that we are making no question here, so fully is it accepted on the other side. We now simply ask, *Was it possible?* and we say, No. It was not possible that any man, in the position supposed, could have made up a Moses such as nothing could make but the Moses-action. Now that the work is done, in the actual book before us, we can perfectly see that we have Moses there. Before that we did not know, and could not have imagined as much. The only thing perfectly certain is that, in venturing upon such ground, we could never have contrived anything so admirably suitable, and so perfectly descriptive. No one living even now—when the novel is so perfected, and no one, surely, in the time of Josiah—could have dared to make Moses speak as he does in this book. If it be only real, it is appropriate and magnificent. If novelistic, it is preposterous and disgraceful. This we plead for on grounds purely literary; and would gladly leave it to the judgment of any who would treat judiciously, on such grounds, the question—Is it possible that the book of Deuteronomy could be a novel?

III. The Man for the Work.

Now it is not a very high character that we have commonly associated with an attempt of this kind. And yet in this case it is a character, the very highest, that is wanted. He who would speak in the name of Moses must be superior, alike in head and heart; of free utterance and ardent patriotism. He must have a rare firmness and individuality of character, being both bold and self-possessed. He must be deeply devout, sincere, and disinterested, honourable and noble-minded, with the power of imparting his spirit to others. Truth must be to him what it was to Moses—supreme. And here it seems—where we could so little have expected it—we have found such

a character! This corner of dust and darkness in which Hilkiah found the book has, with its kindred associations, produced this remarkable author. It was a depressing and self-denying business indeed for such a man. To study and master the character of Moses in his final relations with Israel, and to depict them in all the life of the actual scene—supporting on the same shoulders the grandeur of Moses and his own meanness—speaking in a name which he knew had no standing in the matter, this was the self-imposed task of that noble man. And he takes it up in the deepest piety and the purest philanthropy, with a heart melting, like Jeremiah's, over the Jerusalem of Manasseh, and panting to bring it back to the God of Moses. And the man undertook all this, did he? in the true character of a Hebrew prophet! No; the Hebrew prophet could speak and work only in the light; in the dark he could do nothing. He could speak only as Jehovah spake by him. To personate another lay not in his way. "Thus saith Jehovah," begun and carried out in absolute truthfulness was all that he knew. But to take up a "Thus saith Jehovah" under any other view would have been to him the crime of "stealing Jehovah's words"—a crime which, always discovered, never failed to overwhelm the pretender with confusion. Now of such a thing as a good man acting such a part there is no shadow in the whole compass of Bible history, nor yet in any respectable quarter of secular history, whatever parallel may be found for it amid the knaveries of the world, or the caricatures by clever men. It is true that a Hindoo or Chinese reformer might frame and publish certain words, as from a famous national teacher, as the best means of influencing his people. But there is no resemblance between the cases. For the Hebrew prophet was not a heathen reformer, nor at all dependent on the means that such would resort to, knowing that detection would cost him nothing; whereas if the Hebrew be detected, all is gone. For Hebrew prophets were brought up to truth and honour; Hindoo moralists, not. So these

great prophets could only speak in their true person, and in Jehovah's name, and no more could have put on a Mosaic mask than have thought of mounting to the clouds and discharging thunderbolts from thence. Jeremiah was a man of the time, a true man, if ever there was one, and with the very capacity needed for such a writing as this. And as one of the pleas for the lateness of the book is that Jeremiah was influenced by it, while Isaiah was not, let it be enough to answer that if, in his chapter xi., he really meant Deuteronomy, as seems to be the case, rather than Exodus xxiv., then he himself will tell us from whence his Deuteronomy came. For he gets, we read, a commission to call upon his people to "hear the words of *this covenant.*" And what covenant? "The covenant which I commanded your fathers, in the day when I brought them out of the land of Egypt," &c. That is to say, the covenant which an *actual word of Jehovah, as old as the Exodus*, had announced; and which certainly could not be a thing produced now. The whole is one going back on *that real past*—"That I may perform what I have sworn to your fathers, to give them a land flowing with milk and honey." Now it is a serious thing to say that *this word* did not come to Jeremiah *in this sense*, and to say so, in deference to a certain very novel theory, holding out a new date and authorship for the book. And serious also to make Jeremiah answer such an appeal: "*So be it, O Jehovah!*" And then to represent the actual communication as continuing, "I earnestly protested to your fathers, *in the day when I brought them out of the land of Egypt.* Therefore will I bring upon them all the words *of this covenant which I commanded them to do. For Israel and Judah have broken My covenant which I made with their fathers.*" Now this is surely just what caused Josiah's alarm when the book was discovered—the same book as Jeremiah is now pointing at. And the transgressors, on account of whom the judgment is threatened, are, in a great measure, "*Our fathers.*" (2 Chron. xxxiv. 21.) And it will come too, Josiah is divinely told,

immediately after his death. (*v.* 28.) And yet there never was, we are now told, any such covenant book in existence *for the fathers to rebel against.* Now if it were possible that Jehovah's prophet could truly declare this as the divine word to him, in regard to a composition of yesterday, then truly it is not earth only, but heaven, that has been turned upside down; and we may at once resign ourselves to the consequences. Or, shall we rather rest in the conclusion that, as no man, but such as is pictured above, *could* have written the book in question, so, just as certainly, *no such* man *would* have written it?

Again, as regards the calculable influences of the book on Jeremiah, and not Isaiah, that is only natural. For allowing it not to have been lost in Isaiah's time, still the *recovery* of it was a much more impressive thing for the one than the quiet, unbroken possession of it for the other. Besides this, the attitude of Jeremiah towards his people is much more like that of Moses. He stands face to face with them, quite beyond the usual habit of Isaiah. It is with *them* and their immediate future that he is mainly concerned. And when he does launch out into the Messianic future, as he very grandly does in chapters xxiii. and xxx.–xxxiii., it is much more like the style of Moses in his last prophecies, than of Isaiah in chapters xi. and lx.–lxvi. Hence, with such Moses-like views, it is not strange if Jeremiah falls into a Moses-like style. The two men, both in circumstance and mind, had much in common. And, as to the particular line into which the comparison now falls, each we find had to deal largely in warning and exhortation. Hence it is extremely natural if one, with the mind and heart of Jeremiah, had his style affected by the flow and force and whole drift of Deuteronomy.

IV. The Material and Composition.

Let us see how this is treated by the 'critical' writers. Thus Canon Driver, p. 84: "It is altogether a false view of

the laws in Deuteronomy to treat them as the author's 'inventions.' Many are repeated from the Book of the Covenant; the existence of others is independently attested by the 'Law of Holiness' (*i.e.* Leviticus xvii.–xxvi.); others upon intrinsic grounds are clearly ancient. In some cases modifications are introduced which the tendencies of the age required; but, *on the whole*, the laws of Deuteronomy are unquestionably derived from pre-existent usage, and the object of the author is to insist upon their importance, and to supply motives for their observance. [This is not the stand that D. takes. Nothing will suit him, but that so *Moses said.*] Deuteronomy may be described as the *prophetic reformulation and adaptation to new needs of an older legislation.* Judging from the manner in which the legislation of J E is dealt with in Deuteronomy, it is *highly probable* that there existed the *tradition*—perhaps even in a written form—of a final address by Moses in the plains of Moab, to which some of the laws peculiar to Deuteronomy were attached. There would be an obvious motive for the author's plan, if it could be supposed that he worked it upon a traditional basis. But, undoubtedly, the laws are more ancient than himself. In combining them into a manual for the guidance of the people, and providing them with a hortatory introduction and comments, he cannot, *in the light of the parallels* that *have been referred to* [What are they and of what value?] be held guilty of dishonesty or literary fraud. There is nothing in Deuteronomy implying an interested or dishonest motive on the part of the post-Mosaic author. And this being so [!] its moral and spiritual greatness remains unimpaired [*i.e.* just as if it were, as it professes to be, the real utterance of Moses!]; its inspired authority is in no respect less than that of any other part of the Old Testament which happens to be anonymous." To do justice to all the statements of this passage would be no pleasant task. So we must be content to leave it. We only note with what ease our 'critic' can interchange his 'unquestionably' and 'probably,' and *that*, even when his 'probably' has nothing beyond 'tradition' to rest on.

"Then as to the *execution*. There is a unity of style in the whole work. The impressive individuality of the writer colours whatever he writes. His power as an orator is shown in the long and stately periods with which his work abounds; and the parenetic treatment always maintains its freshness. In his command of a chaste yet warm and persuasive eloquence he stands unique among the writers of the Old Testament." (p. 95.)

Now here is a very specious, or at least special pleading for the moral character of that which by ordinary principles would be counted so grossly immoral. And in this point of view the matter affects the whole field of religion. Was then the thing alleged a moral or an immoral proceeding on the part of the Deuteronomist? That it was or—rather, if in itself a possible thing—*would have been* deeply immoral is to many as clear as any thing in morals. *Was it possible* then? Here is the first question, and upon this we may say a little. The Book of the Covenant, or Law, by the hand of Moses, which was to be kept in or by the side of the ark, had been for some time lost. That is certain. How far it had been missed and regretted we can judge only from the excitement which the reported discovery occasioned. But the employment of such a book, down to the young Joash, and even to Hezekiah, could not have been unknown to priests and prophets in Josiah's time. Unhappily however in the dark days of Manasseh and Amon the book has fallen aside. At last it is accidentally found near to where it should be, and is recognized by all as the lost Book of the Covenant. Such is the statement. And it seems plain that Jeremiah soon put his seal to it as we have seen above (chap. xi.). But now the theory—shall we say discovery?—is that this was all a mistake. There was no such book in existence previous to the *finding* by Hilkiah. Hence, what had been lost, or whether anything, we cannot tell. But this we can clearly see, the "Deuteronomist" has somehow got

the impression of a want, a felt want, and he has said, 'I will supply it'; and out of certain materials at hand, he has made a book—the drift of which is that Moses said so—and has had it hidden in a suitable corner of the temple, until one day being recovered it is accepted as the lost Book of the Covenant, and stamped as such by all the authority, human or Divine, known at that day. As to the author we say no more. But that such was the plot is as certain as that such was the author. His motives may have been as excellent and his abilities as eminent, as his apologists plead. That cannot affect the fact of his *design;* which was to set forth, and get accepted, his book, as the veritable Book of the Covenant, the book which, in every line, declared itself as *spoken* by Moses. Of this the people were seen, or were thought to be, in want, and this want the noble-minded Deuteronomist would, at the risk of detection, generously supply, skilfully calling his writing the word of Moses, as the only passport to its acceptance. This was the design. He was indeed a man of wonderful capacity, as his book shows, and of equal humility and self-restraint, as his conduct shows, thus to keep himself in the background, and with the genius for such a work so to sacrifice himself in order to the blind acceptance by his beloved people of the lost treasure! Such, we say, was his design; and he sailed along, as far as we know, on its smooth current till fairly landed in the haven for which his patriotic heart had panted. It was in the dark indeed that he laboured. Light would have extinguished both him and his book. But happily no light came, and the work was accomplished. It was a stupendous undertaking, and involved very much more of scheming than is here hinted at. Enough that it could never have been done with less. And such an undertaking it can be no exaggeration to pronounce *impossible*. As to the morality of the man, we might, in deference to a widely prevailing opinion, try to think the best. And that would be that he was suffering from strong mental disease, through the violent action of his own

insane goodness! But as to the execution of the design, we can see nothing but impossibility. For his great means—the groundwork of the whole structure—lay, we are told, in the J E compilation, with the other sources suggested, *perhaps* Mosaic, *perhaps* traditional. No one can say more. But, whatever the material, it was no peculium of our Deuteronomist. It was public property—as familiar to Hilkiah and Shaphan, and all the pious, as to him. And yet he ventures to take this public collection, and make it the basis of his secret composition. And so perfectly does he succeed in disguising his own part in the performance, that no one suspected it then, nor till quite lately, when the discovery was made and published. And so this great business was begun and ended in the dark by this most excellent and able man, without a ray of the truth getting abroad. And Moses, who had nothing to do with the book, has got the undying credit of it; while the true author consigned to the darkness which he courted is not even the shadow of a name. And yet between Moses and this floating idea there is now raging a serious battle on the field of modern Criticism. Meanwhile, according to the new view, there was thus quietly brought out the greatest literary contrivance (we must not say forgery) that the world had ever known. The Hebrew nation, without warning, was boldly attacked on its strongest side, and fell under the sudden assault, coming in one hour, without a moment's inquiry, to believe that there had just been recovered a book of Moses, which had been brought out from the brain of a certain great unknown, now, or quite lately, in their midst!

Such was the contrivance, and such—if only presented just as it was—must it have been adjudged by that generation; glossed over, as it is now, till we are at a loss to know whether we are looking at it with our own eyes or not.

A sort of parallel, perhaps, to the critical view of the structure of Deuteronomy, would be Fenelon's *Telemachus*.

Now that is simply a romance for the highest moral purpose, and never was thought of, or accepted, as anything else. But had Fenelon given it out as a lost book of Homer, found amid great excitement, he must certainly have been mad. And all the more, if he had done his work in the dark, and stowed away the book to be some day found among the rubbish of a royal palace.

V. Peculiar Expressions.

Of these we have a formidable list, under forty-one heads, embracing several hundreds of instances. And all these forbid us to believe—it is argued—that the present book and the preceding four can be from the same writer. The Deuteronomist, that is to say, shows himself, by his language, to stand alone. Now, what if these peculiarities arise not from difference of authorship, but difference of position in the one author? And that difference is very great. In the previous books we had Moses simply as Mediator and Legislator, and communicating, as such, just what "Jehovah spake" to him. And this was not precisely the position in which to deal most familiarly or tenderly with his people. His personality was necessarily much merged in his office. But now, if still retaining those functions, he can combine with them the closest fellowship with his beloved Israel, and pour out his soul in earnest exhortation, *that* will make a difference. And further, if feeling that his course is now finished, he can speak out with all the solemnity of so peculiar a leave-taking, and all the experience and mellowness that these forty years have superinduced—this will accentuate the difference. And thus Moses, speaking with new feeling, may require some new expressions. It would rather be strange if the expressions, that had served for all the ordinary past occasions, should serve for this most extraordinary present. Hence, instead of finding reason to say that Moses is not here, we find rather a presumption for believing that he is. And just as we feel it very hard to find

for the solitary Deuteronomist the stimulus for the fresh style and ardent eloquence ascribed to him, so in the case of Moses we find everything to awaken a soul like his at once to the subject and style which distinguish this book. The Moab plains, with Egypt and Sinai behind, Jordan before, Israel all round, and Pisgah close by, were more than man ever yet had to arouse him, and might well inspire a Moses with new eloquence and all its strong expressions. But what shall we say of the unknown man, planning, all alone, to put himself into some of the traditional, or J E situations of Moses, and striving to reproduce from his own brain the discourses befitting the occasion? Is this the condition that was most likely to generate the fire and flow of Deuteronomy? Or, may we be allowed to believe that the views and orations there given were never got up by anyone, apart from their living surroundings, six or eight hundred years afterwards?

When, now, we come to the peculiar expressions that are supposed to sap our old belief in the Mosaic authorship of Deuteronomy, what do we find? The first of them is "to love," with "God for the object," which, we are told, is a "*characteristic* principle" of this book. (1)* And yet this was the very expression which the Divine mouth had employed in the second commandment. And one would have thought that that would have fully entitled Moses to use it now—while we can well understand that, though not generally employed in the legislation of the past, it was the only fit expression to tell out what was in the heart of Moses on this great occasion—*Thou shalt love, love, love, Jehovah thy God.*

In the same terms we have the notices of God's love to His people spoken of as "not so before." It may be, but Moses had only to open his eyes, and see the love of God toward this people, from the call of Abram till his own latest day. And

* N.B.—The figures in brackets throughout this portion stand for the separate heads referred to in Canon Driver's list.

his eyes having looked, he had only to let his heart pour out the declaration to the happy objects of the love. And Moses was not the man to sit down as either blind or dumb in such a situation.

So if God thus *loves* He will certainly *choose* and *bless* (11 and 13), and Moses will not scruple to say so—even if any of his expressions be new—though indeed the very first act towards Abram is the act of choosing, and the first word is of the blessing *to* him and *through* him (Gen. xii. 1–3). Nor need it be any difficulty in the way of the single Mosaic source if those who are thus loved and chosen be called on in new language to "*cleave* to the Lord," and to "rejoice before Him" (15 and 34). Nothing less could bring out the heart of the man who had already felt and spoken, as we have seen.

And what more fit than for Moses now to remind his people that they were a holy *people*, and a people *for a possession?* And what more unfit, we may add, than for a critic to note this as a *characteristic variation* from the "holy *nation*," and "*shall be to Me* for a possession," as in Exodus xix. 5, 6?

And with this intensity of love on both sides how natural would be the expression, "With all thy heart and with all thy soul" (28); and, "Observe and do the statutes," &c. (38, 39.) And how fit to join with this the '*fearing*' of the same God, *even if it be a peculiarity* to say, "That they *may learn* to fear" (23) and "hear and fear" (37), "not turning to the right hand or the left." (30.) Then "the mighty hand and the outstretched arm" (10), how could the speaker, standing where he did, do without these? and the *redemption from Egypt* (32), *the house of slaves* (5, 16)? And is it anything very peculiar if now, for the first time, the words *from Egypt* be attached to a very common word for *redeem* (padah), even though not before employed *in that precise connection?* It was fully used in regard to the same event, though in another connection; as Exodus xiii. 13, xxxiv. 20, three times each. Why not now, then, with the words "from Egypt," if suitable here?

And pursuing the line of Mosaic thought—if Egypt, now fading in the distance, was thus fitly held up for remembrance —how was it possible to be silent about Canaan—Canaan, with its blessings and duties and dangers; yes, Canaan, with its cities and their gates, just waiting to take in the wanderers from the wilderness? (4, 6, 19, 20, 40.) How with such a prospect should Moses not insist upon all that should make it to be "well with them, that they might prolong their days in the good land"? (21.) It had been strangely un-Mosaic in such circumstances not to be stirred up to such a warmth of feeling and freshness of language.

Such is the greater part of the passages supposed to indicate a non-Mosaic authorship. As to some other of the expressions we can at once see them as being in the same connection with the recorded position of the speaker. Thus (35), "*To make His name to dwell there.*" It is of small importance whether the phrase occur in other books of the Pentateuch. But it is of great consequence that it so fits in with the style of address here. (xii. 11.) "When ye go over Jordan . . . then there shall be a place which the Lord will choose to cause His name to dwell there." And five times more, all in connection with the *choosing* and the worship. Now whether is it more natural, that the actual Legislator should speak in this pointed way to his people, in regard to their duty, in *the expected circumstances*, when, what was all moving now, should be *all fixed?* or that the 7th century individual should transfer himself to the ancient scene, and there speak as if he did not know what he knew so well, as to the site of the chosen place? Does it not seem, when so regarded, that mere novelty of expression is not for a moment to be thought of, unless it be to remark that the novelty of situation easily gives out its own phrases?

Another of the expressions (27) is, "The priests, the levites." (xvii. 9, 18; xviii. 1; xxiv. 8; xxvii. 9.) Now it is very hard to see why, after so long a time since the other books were written, there might not be introduced this change from the

expression 'sons of Aaron,' especially since Aaron was now dead. And it is something that, in accordance with this, we have sons of 'Levi' instead of 'Aaron' in xxi. 5; xxxi. 9—"The priests the sons of Levi." Thus we meet an objection, which had better not have been made; viz., "P's expression, 'Sons of Aaron,' is never used in Deuteronomy." What if this just comes from the fact that the real Deuteronomy is many hundred years before the age assigned to P?

Or is the collocation of the three, "stranger, fatherless, and widow," so very peculiar and strongly Deuteronomic? (14.) Be it so, and it is hard to see how such a very natural usage of allied words should be thus taken up. But in the short passage (Exodus xxii. 21) the same language occurs; and if once there why not six times here, amid the multifarious exhortations that would all so soon be needed?

Again. Does it really call for criticism (as in 18) if Moses three times in the course of those exhortations warns against the neglect of duty, saying, "Lest it be sin to thee"? (xv. 9; xxiii. 21; xxiv. 15.) The remaining cases might be regarded as having no historical or moral element in them, and might therefore more reasonably be set down as *mere expressions* more clearly betokening a new writer. Now, even were it so, we would answer, "May not Moses then use such expressions here, in a field so wide, and so peculiarly his own, even though up till now he has had so little opportunity for any very distinctive style"? And this we think would meet a list of peculiarities much larger than the present. But there is something more to be said for some of the cases in question. We begin with the peculiar expression for 'thoroughly,' which is nothing but a participle of the verb *to be good*, used adverbially, equal, in short, to the English '*well*'; and if this in those cases should simply mean *thoroughly* we should explain it, as now indicated. But as the word 'well' in English can be taken in two ways—and that at the same time—we do not see why the corresponding Hebrew word may not be also. And if

Hebrew writers, like Moses, were apt enough to make the most of mere syllables, we are prepared to take this word as meaning in each of the five cases something more than 'thoroughly.' Thus when Moses tells the people (ix. 21) that he had '*well* ground the golden calf to powder,' we can hardly fail to catch the tone of moral satisfaction with which he spoke the word. The other cases are xiii. 14, xvii. 4, xix. 18, xxvii. 8, in each of which the word can perfectly mean something in addition to 'thoroughly.'

The next case *Kerebh* (33) for 'amidst' might be given as a model of a loose style of thinking. It is, we are told, "a favourite word in Deuteronomy." And, at the same time, that it "*naturally occurs* in J E as *also elsewhere*." The peculiarity amounts to this, that "in P *another word* (tok) *is preferred*."

Another case (24) is "*lo tucal* in the sense of *not to be allowed*." Nine cases are given with the remark "a very uncommon use, cf. Gen. xliii. 32." The cases are vii. 22; xii. 17; xvi. 5; xvii. 15; xxi. 16; xxii. 3, 19, 29; xxiv. 4. The idea in all is very simple—Thou mayest not consume—eat—sacrifice—set a stranger. He may not put her away—may not take a wife. And this use, we are told, of such a word is very uncommon. Will any one give a little attention to the following cases—with the same verb—and say how far the use is "very uncommon"? Genesis xxxi. 35, "I cannot rise up," am not allowed to; Numbers xxii. 18, xxiv. 13, "I cannot go beyond the word"; xxii. 38, "Have I power to say anything"; Judges xi. 35, "I cannot go back"; 1 Kings xiii. 16, "I cannot go in with thee"; xx. 9, "This thing I cannot do"; Ruth iv. 6 (bis) "I cannot redeem it for myself"; Nehemiah vi. 3, "I cannot come down"; Numbers ix. 6, "could not (were not allowed to) keep the passover." In all which cases, generally speaking, the word 'may' might be used, just as in Deuteronomy. What it is that can induce any modern 'critic' to employ such an argument it is not for us to say, for it is not very remarkable in a hortatory book like this, and

full of prohibition, in the 2nd sing., that the form now noted should be used seven times, out of the nine cases quoted two of them having the 3rd, and *that* when the word is so common as we find this one to be. But this last view he omitted to add. He also omitted to say that while the Deuteronomist was fond of the word in this "very uncommon sense" he also used it freely in the more ordinary sense of not *being able;* as Deuteronomy i. 9; vii. 17; xxxi. 2; xiv. 24; ix. 28; xxviii. 27, 35 (*lo tucal, thou canst not* be healed).

Another peculiar expression occurring seven times is "work of the hands" (31). Now this seems extremely natural for a people just entering into a land all their own. And with equal propriety, in another field, those things would come to be forbidden, which were "Jehovah's abominations" (44), chiefly heathen or idolatrous customs. It seems hardly fit to enter any formal plea for Moses' right to use such language, though for the first time.

Once more, "the expression for delivering up to (29) is peculiar;" for whereas the usual phrase is to *give into the hand*, it is here to *give before the face of*. Again we might say that Moses might surely be allowed his choice in all such matters. But enough to quote from Gesenius, "To give into the hand = to deliver into one's power. Not much different is to *give up*, to deliver *in the presence* of anyone—the former being used more of persons, and this of things, *e.g.* a *land, region.* Deut. i. 8, 21; ii. 31, 33."

After such charges, as to language, we only remark that we have here fresh proof of the extreme haste with which the 'critics' endeavour to wrest this book from Moses, so as to put it into the hands of an imaginary writer who understood his style so badly. Why, we are forced to ask, being the extremely able man that he was, did he not study his J E compilation better, and thus learn what expressions to put, and what not to put, into the mouth of Moses? This we would take, even if standing alone, as an unanswerable objection to the modern

view of Deuteronomy. For, if so much depends on the alleged fact that the book is based on J E as regards *subject-matter*, how account for it that this most successful student of the compilation in *that* respect should so grievously have missed its *style*, as to furnish one of the principal proofs that the Deuteronomist cannot have been the writer of any previous part?

But the whole, indeed, of this argument from new expressions is of the narrowest. No good writer could stand the test; and the best could stand it worst. For who is there, in writing, at an interval of forty years, and in circumstances of the utmost diversity, that is not drawn into the same variety? Look, *e.g.* to the writer in the N. T., who comes nearest to Moses—take his speeches at Athens, Miletus, Jerusalem, Cæsarea, with his epistles from *Romans* to *Philemon*, and see in how many cases there are not thoughts and expressions that are found nowhere else. Then say how many of these writings might not, on such grounds, be rejected as entirely un-Pauline. How easy it would be to plead that he who wrote *Romans* never wrote the 2nd to Corinth—nay more, that it could never be the same man who wrote both the epistles to that same church. It is high time, in short, that such a style of criticism were abandoned. A man like Paul—just because he was such a man—could be extremely various in thought and expression, and so for the same reason could Moses.

VI. Discordances between Deuteronomy and Previous Books.

1. In regard to the release of *bondmen*.

We are told (Driver, p. 77) that Deut. xv. 17 and xv. 1–11 are in conflict with Exod. xxi. 2 *sqq.* and xxiii. 10 *sq.* respectively—these last all J E passages—there being variations in them difficult to reconcile with both, as the work of a single "legislator." Now, as this '*difficulty*' seems so easily removable, we pass on to the more serious case which follows—only remarking here that the Deuteronomist, who based his work

on J E, might have been expected to adhere better to his original, so as not thus to give room for talking about a different legislator.

The more serious case is this—"When the laws of Dt. are compared with those of P, such a supposition (as the altered condition at the end of the forty years' journeying) becomes impossible. For, in Dt., language is used implying that *fundamental institutions of P are unknown to the author.* Thus, while Lev. xxv. 39-43 (this being by P) enjoins the release of the *Hebrew slave in the year of jubilee*—the legislator, in Deut. xv. 12–18, *prescribes the release of the Hebrew slave, in the seventh year of his service.*" Now a little reflection will shew that this is simply the fallacy of *taking the same word in different senses.* The word is "Hebrew slave," and in Deut. and Exod. it is taken as *strictly such.* Not only has the man been bought, but he serves as a pure bondman for six years, when he goes free, unless he desires to continue a bondman for life.

The other case is (Lev. xxv. 38) "*If thy brother that dwelleth by thee be waxen poor, and be sold to thee, thou shalt not compel him to serve as a bond-servant, but as a hired servant, and a sojourner shall he be with thee,* and shall serve thee till the year of jubilee." The last expression is notable, "shall serve *with thee*," as Jacob *serving with Laban* (Gen. xxix. 25). Thus it is no different legislation for *the same case* that we have to deal with—but *two cases* entirely different, and, we may say, actually contrasted. In the one case we have a genuine bond-servant, working out his discharge by six years' labour. In the other, that of a decayed brother, who obtains for his support—sold though he has been because of poverty—the position of a *hired and friendly servant.* Is this a case, then, with which to assail the unity of the Pentateuch legislation?

2. The next discordance is this, "In the laws of P in Leviticus and Numbers a sharp distinction is drawn between the priests and common Levites; but in Deut. xviii. 1 "it is implied that all members of the tribe of Levi are qualified to

exercise priestly functions." (DRIVER, as above.) Now just see what ground there is for this assertion. It is simply declared, in the words quoted, that the priests and the members of the tribe of Levi are at one in *having no ordinary portion with Israel*, while the distinction between the two in the other books is not alluded to here. On the contrary, the sacrificial work, with its dues, is in this very paragraph (3–5) as expressly assigned to the *priests* as it is anywhere else; while, as to the special function of the Levites, nothing is said here or in this book. It is true that the country Levite, if he conceives a desire to serve at the sanctuary, may freely come to it, when his position shall be the same as that of those who have been there already. And "they shall have like portions to eat." (*vv* 6–8.) It is true the priest and the Levite are equally to "minister" (5, 7), each of course *in his own way*. And the expression is wide enough to cover all their functions, even when so definitely put as to "minister in the name of Jehovah."

Again, we are told that Deut. xviii. 3, which prescribes a certain offering to the priest from '*sacrifices*,' is in conflict with Lev. vii. 30, 99, where the prescription is slightly different, there being certain *additions* in Deuteronomy. Now it is probable enough, as has been suggested, that these are meant as over and above the order in Leviticus, which would well harmonize with the Deuteronomic style. But minute matters like this, where we know so little, afford slender ground for a hostile argument.

3. We read next of discordance between Numb. xxxv. and Deut. xviii. 6, the former "prescribing Levitical cities," while the other speaks of the Levite as "sojourning in one of the cities of Israel." But where is the discordance? The Levite did certainly sojourn in "one of the cities of Israel," since it was from these that the 'Levitical cities' were taken. (Numb. xxxv. 2.) Nor are we entitled to assume that the Levites formed their only population. And yet, while living in them, it was only as "sojourners." For their means of livelihood

were not there, only suburban ground for cattle; while there was the liability to be called away at any time on their Levitical duties. And as for the passages quoted to prove that they are "frequently alluded to as scattered about the land" (Deut. xii. 18, 19; xiv. 27, 29; xvi. 11, 14; xxvi. 11–13), let any one look into them, and he will find that the Levites are there spoken of as either *at the central sanctuary* or *in their own city*. It is in one or other of these that they are receiving the benefactions of the Israelites. So little is there in this objection. The next is less superficial.

4. *The law of tithes.* Let us give the statement in full. "This in Deuteronomy is in conflict with that of P on the same subject. In Numb. xviii. 21–24 the tithes, both animal and vegetable (Lev. xxvii. 30, 32), are definitely assigned to the Levites, who in their turn pay a tenth to the priests. (Numb. xviii. 26–28.) In Deuteronomy there appears to be no injunction respecting the tithes of animal produce; but the reservation of a tithe of vegetable produce (xii. 17 *sq.*; xiv. 22) is enjoined, which is be consumed by the offerer like the firstlings at a sacrificial feast, in which the Levite shares only in company with others as the recipient of a charitable benevolence. A large proportion therefore of what is assigned in Numbers to the Levites remains implicitly the property of the lay Israelite in Deuteronomy." (Driver, p. 78.) Now this is formidable. The two views cannot both be correct. No credible writer could have given first the one then the other in the sense here put upon the second. Before proceeding we simply remark upon the assurance quoted above, that nothing in the moral character or value—no, not even the inspiration of the book—is at all affected by the 'critical view.' D writes, we are told, in perfect good faith, and that should be enough. Be it so, but then P comes afterwards and upsets him; or we may say that D raises by anticipation an impregnable barrier against the coming P, and then when P comes he equally annihilates

D. What if, after all, the truth be, as hitherto accepted, that the author of the separate portions is single, but the view given by him is double?

Thus we approach the subject of the tithes with the allied matters in Deuteronomy.

Now one cardinal principle in the case is this, that in Exodus—Numbers the dealing is directly with the *Levitical order*, and in Deuteronomy with the *people*. I say *directly*, because, of course, where the one comes in the other does *not* go out, the inter-action between them being constant. The one party has got a religious work entrusted to it, on which, in some respects, everything for the nation depends. And the other is charged with the entire support of that party.

Now so important is the religious function that the portion from Exodus xxv. to Numbers is in a great measure the legislative enactment of *that*. In Deuteronomy, on the other hand, the dealing is chiefly with the *people*. Hence this may be called *their handbook*, as the other was the *priests'*; it is not now "Jehovah spake unto Moses," but "Moses spake to Israel." And this distinction will explain much. It will show us how, in regard to the priestly work of the first portion, the people's great duty is to provide for the support of its ministers. And how, in the second portion, there is but little said of the direct work of the priests; but more for the people, to keep them at their proper work in the sanctuary services. And so, both here and generally in Deuteronomy, the business is to exhort them to their duty. It is the Divine word to them before entering Caanan. And thus we can understand, without any straining of the language, what we find in Jeremiah vii. 22, "I spake not to your fathers, nor commanded them, in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt-offerings or sacrifices; but this I commanded them, *Obey My voice*, and I will be your God, and ye shall be My people," &c. So again, with great emphasis, "Hear ye the words of this Covenant," &c. (xi. 1–8.)

This, then, may help us to understand how the great matter of the priestly support, by tithes, and firstfruits, and firstlings, and special sacrificial portions, is chiefly dealt with in the prior books; while the hardly defined supplement for the Levites comes out in the practical dealings with the people in Deuteronomy. The one party has got the prime work to do, already noticed. Hence the place assigned to it at the first. The other party has to make the work possible. Hence the place accorded to it now.

Seeing, then, that the full tithes of the people's yearly produce were received by the Levites for the support of their whole tribe, how were they collected? Did the Levites wait till they were brought to them? Or did they go for the tithes? To this we cannot hesitate in replying, *They went for them.* This, we should presume, from the absence of anything to the contrary, and from the direct statement, "*I have given them to the Levites to inherit*" (Numb. xviii. 24). But we do more than presume; we conclude the same from the explicit word, "*When ye take* from the children of Israel the tithes which I have given you from among them for your inheritance," &c. (*v.* 26). This 'take' is repeated in verse 28. And though it *could* mean simply to *receive what was brought*, still 'take' is *the proper sense*, and better accords with the function of fully executing the Divine mandate to "take the tithes." And it was a more Divine thing, so to speak, for Jehovah thus to commission a servant to go and take what was *His*, with the design of making it over to the Levites, than to order him to wait till whoever chose brought it, and then simply *receive* it.

We come now to the view which Deuteronomy itself gives of *Tithes*, whether expressly or by implication. The 'critical' view is that the regulations in Leviticus–Numbers belong entirely to P, not earlier than 600 B.C., since such a thing became possible only after the fall of the monarchy, and could not therefore have been taught by the Deuteronomist (620 B.C.).

But a little reflection will show this to be an impossible view. For the Deuteronomist *certainly knew that there must be some provision for the regular support of the priests.* He could not possibly be ignorant of what Hezekiah had done towards that (2 Chron. xxxi. 4–10), and what was implied in the act. Besides which it is admitted in the plea for the late authorship of the book that there was *tradition* to build upon, as well as older legislation, and perhaps even some written documents. And yet the author, it is supposed, entirely passes over the priests, and only makes allowance for an *occasional supplement* to the *Levites'* support, and that as dependent on the good-will of the individual Israelite. But this could only be a part of the case. The supplement implied an antecedent substance. And no one could mean to prescribe for the Levite a mere share in a feast with various other parties (as in Deut. xii. 12, 18; xiv. 29; xvi. 11), apart from any standing provision either for *himself* or the *priest.* Hence *the tithe* of Deuteronomy, which was to be shared at the sacrificial feasts, could never be the *primary* provision for any one, but could only be *secondary* to the regular provision for the Levitical body, on which depended the whole worship of Israel, of which the festal visits to Jerusalem were the smaller part. The offerings, in short, in those passages of Deuteronomy are partly the same as in Leviticus—Numbers and partly different. The burnt-offering is always the same, except as the *occasion* may differ, being given to the altar only. Of other sacrifices the offerer may eat only of the *thank-offering.* Hence, when we read in Deuteronomy xii. 27 of the 'burnt-offering,' and other 'sacrifice,' the whole concluding with, "Thou shalt eat the flesh," we know at once to what that applies, and how the difference betwixt this and the same at other times is only in the larger number of partakers. For the priest here as elsewhere has first received his share. There is just one case which is a clear exception to the rest, and that is the *tithe.* For this is here given up entirely to the offerer, who shares it with the needy

and the *Levite*, even the *priest* receiving nothing. Now this certainly is not the tithe which was handed over *en masse* for the support of the Levitical body, and which, as has been said, the people could not possibly be ignorant of. As to the one, the Israelite has it only to part with, as Jehovah's debtor. As to the other, the Levite can only share in it as the Israelite's guest. Hence, combining all, we have every reason to conclude that the tithe in Deuteronomy is not the same as in Leviticus—Numbers. That is to say, it is a veritable *second* tithe, carried in fractions to the Sanctuary, and used in religious festivals as directed; while the other goes at once to the Levites, who have to give a tenth of it to the priests. It is strictly Jehovah's tithe, and as His property is made over to His ministers. This is plainly the meaning in Deuteronomy xviii. 1: "The priests the Levites, and all the tribe of Levi, shall have no part nor inheritance with Israel: they shall eat the fire-offerings of Jehovah, *and His inheritance.*" Remarkable word—*Eat His inheritance*—which can have only the one meaning—*the tithes which are His portion.* "*For all the tithe of the land is Jehovah's*" (Lev. xxvii. 18, 32.) So in Numbers xviii. 24, "All the tithes of the children of Israel, *which they offer as a heave-offering* to *Jehovah*, I have given to the Levites to inherit." This, of course, was only a part of the inheritance; but it is *the part* singled out in both those places; that in Numbers, and this in Deuteronomy, where they are manifestly the same. The consequence is that the Levitical body having thus made over to them Jehovah's inheritance, have "Jehovah for their inheritance" (Deuteronomy xviii. 2), "as He hath said unto them," *i.e.* in Numbers xviii. 21, 24. Thus are the two bound into one. Thus manifestly is it *the law of the national tithing* that forms the subject in both.

There is something in this, then, carrying us quite beyond the *presumption* with which we started, strong as that was.

But besides this there is positive proof that Deuteronomy did understand the principal national tithing. For what else

can be the meaning of xxvi. 12 than that the regular *annual tithe* had its amount struck once in three years, the other two years simply paying according to this assessment? It was a most important arrangement, and must have prevented much inconvenience.

Further, this tithing is not of the fruits of the earth only, as in chapter xii. &c., but "*the tithes of all thine increase*" (*v.* 12), as in Leviticus xxvii. 30–32; Numbers xviii. 21; 2 Chronicles xxxi. 5, 6. The first thing, of course, after this tithing is that the Levites *take* their due. This is not mentioned here —as being involved in the thing itself. But another thing is mentioned as a specialty. There was the employment of the other tithe, and that, in this case, was peculiar. See how it reads: "When thou hast made an end of tithing all the tithes of thine increase . . . and hast *given to* the Levite, the stranger, the fatherless, the widow . . . as Thou hast commanded me." Two things are here observable. It is not "given *it*," as in our two versions. For that full tithe was not so given. Nor could it be said of such giving, "Which Thou hast commanded me" (*v.* 13). Hence this giving is simply the giving of the second tithe, according to the Deuteronomic 'Commandment.' And the peculiarity in regard to that is this, it is not taken on this occasion for a feast at the Sanctuary, but distributed, so that they may "*eat in their gates and be filled*"; whilst the distributer shall say, "I have brought away the hallowed things out of mine house, and have given them to the Levite, and the stranger," &c. This surely is no Sanctuary Festival, but the giving from house to house what there was to be distributed by the owner, after the regular tithe had entirely passed out of his hands. Thus every third year, the parties for whom this benefaction was designed are served at their own homes, and spared the labour of the journey for it.

It may now be seen, by comparing this passage with xiv. 22–29, that the second tithe is equally brought forward in each, that being the single subject in the earlier portion, while here it is

by implication conjoined with the other. The difference in short is that in the second case it is "*All the tithes of thine increase*" in "the year of tithing," while in the other it is "*All the increase of thy seed.*" The ordinary taking up of this for the Sanctuary Feast is expressly described in the first. The special employment of it at home in the third year is made equally plain in both.

5. The last objection that we need notice is this, "Further" (says Dr. Driver, p. 78), "Deuteronomy xii. 17, xv. 19, conflict with Numbers xviii. 18. In Numbers the firstlings of oxen and sheep are expressly and absolutely given to the priest, in Deuteronomy they are to be eaten by the owner himself at the Central Sanctuary." Now the first half of the statement is unquestionable. But what of the second? Why fix upon the *firstlings* [these are always the difficulty], and an assumed eating of *them*, as making the discordance? Why not bring in the *burnt-offering* and *heave-offering* in the same view? For the three are put precisely upon the same footing at the sacrificial feast, and yet they were equally unlawful to the offerer for private use. The burnt-offering was of course for the altar only, and the heave-offering by its very name signified that it was all parted with, as holy *to the Lord, for the priest.* Now the writer of Deuteronomy knew *that* as well as any one, and could never mean to signify that *these* were to be feasted on by the offerer. And thus is established the principle, that of the various articles brought by the worshipper those only could be used for his feast *which were otherwise allowable.* Since these two were not, then the mention of them here could not mean that this was their destination. And, advancing one step further, it can as confidently be laid down as notorious that all sorts of first-born were as entirely outside the owner's control. And any one, in fact, who was in a condition to write the book of Deuteronomy knew that as well as the author of Numbers. Nor let it be here forgotten that in regard to 'burnt-offering' the Deuter-

onomist in this very chapter consigns that entirely to the *altar;* while, as to the other sacrifices mentioned, *the flesh was to be eaten by the offerer* after the blood had been poured out (*v.* 27).

Thus, then, stood the case with the worshipper. Having brought to the sanctuary a variety of articles, he was to set apart, for the altar and the priest, that which had been Divinely destined for such use; after which he was to feast on the rest with his family and servants, inviting to the same the needy and the Levite. The whole is told in the style of Deuteronomy, as by one quite understanding what he was writing about, and to *those who had independent information on the separate points.* They knew, *e.g.*, that the burnt-offering was entirely for the altar. They knew that the heave-offerings belonged to the priests. And they knew that they had no personal property—in an article so certainly dedicated to God as the *first-born* was. Hence they knew how to explain the passages that have given rise to so much controversy.

One wonders, after all this, to find an orthodox commentator like Keil seeking to get away from an imaginary difficulty by supposing that the priest might invite the offerer to partake with him of his own feast on the firstlings, as if that met in any sense the idea of the sacrificial feast got up by the offerer for himself and the other parties. Not more happy is the suggestion by the same writer, that this "command to bring the firstlings was given not merely to the laity of Israel, but to all, including priests and Levites;" which, whatever truth it has in it, has nothing to do with the action of the ordinary offerer in bringing *his* offering for the priest on the one hand, and in getting up his own sacrificial meal on the other.

Various other expedients have been tried for solving the difficulty. Thus it has been said that the 'firstlings' might be females, or some other young animals brought forward for the purpose. Now it does not seem to be seen that no solution —however superior to these—can meet the case, so long as it leaves the other two articles untouched with *their* difficulty.

JOSHUA.

THE first question is as to the *author;* and, while there are not grounds for a decided answer, there is none nearly so probable as Joshua himself or someone connected with him, as Eleazar or Phinehas. For, first, Joshua was Moses' *minister*, chosen for his ability, and matured by his experience; and he was both so familiar with the fact of Moses "writing in the book," and was himself of such a temperament and style of life, as makes it hard to think that he could allow such events to pass without making a record of them. Then he is called to keep close to his master's example and to fulfil the charge left by him, with a view to which "This book of the law shall not depart out of thy mouth." If any man, then, in those times was fit and likely to write his own memoirs, it was Joshua, and he did write some part of them, we are told. (xxiv. 26.) And if Joshua could give utterance to the sentiment, "This stone shall be a witness unto us; for it hath heard all the words of the Lord" (xxiv. 27), it can hardly be thought that he was not equally alive to a still better witness, so clearly within his reach.

Now, as to the introduction (i. 2–9), it professes to be the direct word of Jehovah to Joshua. Who, then, could have told it so fully, and yet succinctly? The words are all worthy of the Divine Speaker, and equally become the recorder if that be the receiver.

Verse 2: "Moses my servant is dead." Now this *might be* a practical *reference* to the *fact after* the 30 days of mourning (Deut. xxxiv. 8), but the words sound more like the *announcement* of the fact; for that was known at the first to the One only, and we cannot suppose that, without such an intimation, the people would have ventured, after their experience of Moses' disappearance, to assume the death and commence the mourning. Hence we may suppose that this intimation to Joshua was the first news of the death of Moses. But, whether the first or not, it was a word which we cannot imagine as having come down the stream, to find its earliest record, hundreds of years afterwards, by an unknown collector. And, if the word was never really spoken, there is a stroke of genius, with which we cannot credit that collector, in his having thus inserted a trait so truly dramatic.

We must notice here what the new criticism says as to the *composite* character of the book. "From chapter i. 12" (says Canon DRIVER) "the main narrative appears to be a continuation of J E, the use of P being rare. In xiii.–xxiv. the work of P predominates." But there is still another collector, who, "strongly imbued with the spirit of Deuteronomy, may be termed the Deuteronomic editor, and called D^2." To this D^2 is ascribed chapter i., from its style, J E not appearing till chapter ii. Now Deuteronomy did not appear till about 621 B.C., and D^2 is later with his Joshua narrative. For making this he had his own reasons, as J and E had already made *their* collection. These different accounts, then, had the field to themselves, till the famous P put out his hand to gather fresh matter, and prepare the way for the final Redactor. Thus, though the work of chronicling the history of Joshua had been strangely neglected by himself, as well as by his contemporaries and immediate followers, it was most assiduously gone about in after ages, when it might have been supposed to be forgotten.

Yes, and the very words were then set down—about 800

years afterwards—the words said to constitute the Divine charge given to him. It may be a problem indeed how these —though not counted worthy of record by any man of the day —should yet, after such an interval, have obtained their resurrection through one who got his inspiration from king Josiah's Deuteronomist. So much more powerful an incentive to the continuation of the story did this man's late novel prove than all the Joshua realities of Jordan and the conquest.

What better, then, than one huge mist does this mass of assumption and assertion amount to? And what is the imaginary Redactor but the hero of a great cloud chariot, managing the masses of mist at his pleasure, and causing them to drop down their rain here and there as suited him? The cloud-compelling Jove of the Homeric myth is simplicity to this.

With such an arrangement, then, there was nothing more natural than incongruity and dislocation; and yet it was just the Redactor's part to prevent all that, and to present a consistent narrative from the various sources, and yet in this he is constantly failing. He seems, indeed, not to know what harmony means. Of this we have an example in this first section; for, according to Dr. Driver, Joshua intimates to the people that in three days they are to pass the Jordan. But it is not till after this time has elapsed that the spies return from Jericho, and then, according to J E, a new order is given to move *after the next three* days. Now it is quite reasonable to suppose, with some, that the three days of chapter i. are coincident with the three days of the spies. Still, it does seem that the time before crossing was more than three days after the first order; but it is no discredit to Joshua if, through unforeseen circumstances, he was obliged to give a second order, the interval of three days being still adhered to. (*Cf.* Exodus xix. 11.) Thus the reality of the events would explain all. And it speaks strongly for the unity of authorship that it was

thought enough to relate just what happened, however the second notice might seem to conflict with the first. We cannot easily suppose, on the other hand, that a Redactor, having before him inharmonious accounts, would needlessly throw them all into one inharmonious heap. Anyone in such a position would certainly know that J, E, D^2, and P required to have their statements sorted and sifted, and, so far as the theory goes, this was the man's very business, though from some cause or other he is extremely apt to fall asleep.

Rahab and the Spies.

Chapter ii.

It is not in our line to insist on the proofs of minute acquaintance with the original scene here displayed, such as the flax just gathered, and the vicinity of the (Quarantana) mountains, as furnishing, with their caves, all the concealment desirable, for it might be answered that an historical novel could have been quite as exact; but there still remains what cannot be so disposed of. For something, not materially differing from the account as we have it, must have taken place between the woman and the spies. That is implied in the very 'criticism' of the terms. The important question is as to the transmission of the news. This is easy, so long as we admit of contemporary memoirs, but to imagine such matters continuing to go between mouth and ear for some 700 years, to be then registered—and so fresh, apparently—by J E, with an additional memoir from D^2, worthy to furnish the Redactor with the fresh matter of verses 10 and 11—this is a view entirely outside of ordinary comprehension. Whether the thought is ever really grasped and handled we do not know. We have only seen it asserted, as if nothing more were wanted than the word of a 'critic.'

Passage of Jordan.

Chapters iii. iv.

This portion is assigned to J, E, D^2, and P, as indicating so many separate narratives. Take, then, the first paragraph, chapter iii. 1–12. All goes on smoothly, though the joint work of J E and D^2 (who contribute verses 2–4, 6–9), till we reach verse 12. Then comes (1) the objection that that verse goes for nothing if we imagine the narrative to be the work of a single author, for there is no connection between it and what follows. It is certainly, however, in perfect order with what precedes. Verse 11 had said "The ark passeth over," &c., and verse 12 continues, "And *now* take you twelve men." Let us specially mark the *now*. True, it will be said, But why not say here what the twelve men are wanted for? Nay, why say it? May not the God of Israel call out twelve men for some special service, under sealed orders for the present? The people had just said, "Whatsoever thou commandest us we will do," and now they are taken at their word. "The Lord hath need of them"; this for the present. Fresh orders will follow; and in the very next sentence the purport of these is hinted at, for it points forward to the standing of the priests' feet in Jordan. Meanwhile let the men be in readiness for that. (2) The passage (it is said) is completed in iii. 17, and yet, by what follows, it is not over till iv. 10, 11. Now it is quite true that in iii. 17 the body of the people has passed over; but what if certain men have still to go back? And so it is when the twelve are sent in about the stones, which leads (3) to the question as to the real *location of the stones*, and whether there were two cairns or only one, which last we now maintain; for, "the people having all passed over" (iv. 1), Joshua now gets the direction for the work of the twelve. They are to "take" (let us say *lift up*, *raise*) "out of the midst of Jordan, out of the place where the priests' feet *are firm*" [there is no

'stood'], "and carry them over, and leave them in the lodging place." This is all *leave*, not *set up*.

So "Joshua called the men whom he had prepared," and said, "Pass on before the ark into the midst of Jordan, and raise up for you, each one, a stone on his shoulder." And the twelve stones are to be a sign in days to come "that the waters of Jordan were cut off before the ark." So they went, raised the stones, carried them over to the lodging-place, and *laid them down.*

Now we assume that this took place *in the midst of Jordan* —not, as has been strangely said, on the overflown eastern bank before entering the river; for that, instead of being *the midst of Jordan*, was only the green sward under water for the time, and no place to furnish such stones. Nor would the priests' feet, when barely wet, be spoken of as '*standing firm.*' No such position could suit the description, "The ark goeth before you into Jordan." Nor could the designed guarantee for the general safety be thus afforded by the imposing spectacle of the *priests standing in the midst.*

So far then there is no appearance of more cairns than one. It is verse 9 that has given the impression of the two, and no wonder. The words as they stand are, "And twelve stones set up Joshua in the midst of Jordan, in the place where the priests' feet stood: and there they are unto this day." We remark then:

(1) The entire design is represented as being to set up *one cairn.* (*vv.* 3–5.)

(2) And that *to be seen* as a sufficient memorial for the ages to come.

(3) A cairn in the midst of the river would neither be stable nor visible.

(4) *Joshua sets up* the stones which the twelve men had *raised*, *carried over*, and *laid down.*

But what about the setting up in the *midst of Jordan?* Is that *really said?* And was it, by the new 'criticism,' a *fact*,

or only a *mistake* by J or E, between whom verses 8, 9 are parted?

Now that such a thing is *not said* appears thus:

(1) If the *setting up* in verse 9 had been of a second cairn in Jordan, then there would be no mention at all of the *setting up* of the first at Gilgal, which was certainly the principal and original thing.

(2) There was no order for any second going into the river, or any second *setting up* of stones. And it is foreign to the style of the narrative to suppose either of those without an express order.

(3) Not only so, but Joshua must be supposed not to have *sent* the men to set up the cairn in the river, but to have gone with them, and put his own hand to the setting it up; for no such matter could have been left simply to the twelve.

(4) And there they are unto this day; *i.e.*, just in *the place* pointed out from the first.

It seems clear then that there were no two memorials set up. And yet it also *seems* that verse 9 speaks of one *in* Jordan. But does it really do so? We believe not. The Syriac version, apparently to get quit of the difficulty, renders "twelve stones from Jordan." But this, being quite unsupported, we cannot think of. Still we can make use of it; for it implies an ellipsis of the word *taken*, than which nothing could be more legitimate. Now we have only to retain the '*in*,' and make the same supplement, viz. *taken in Jordan*. All appearance of the *two* monuments thus vanishes. And the context seems absolutely to require the supplement.

This now brings us to the complete view of the people passing over; for after the passage of the general company there are still twelve to come, and we may well suppose that each of these would require one at least to help him with such a load to his shoulder. The priests, of course, remained behind till all besides had done their work and left. And it is something very special that seems noted in verse 10: "For the

priests *kept standing* in the midst of Jordan, until every thing was finished that Jehovah commanded Joshua to speak to the people." Yes, the priests *kept standing*, "and" (or *but*) "the people *hasted and passed over*. And when all the people were clean passed over, then the ark of the Lord passed over, *and the priests*." Who then, *in such a connection*, were *all the people*—but just the whole body—with reference here to those who had come for the stones? If now there be any doubt about this interpretation it seems that verse 20 might remove it. "Those twelve stones, which they *took out of Jordan*, did Joshua *set up*" (*v.* 9) "in Gilgal"—the order (in *v.* 9) being now executed. And then it seems, from verses 21–23, that these stones were not only *a* memorial, but *the memorial* of the great event.

Chapter v. is occupied with the *circumcision*, which had been omitted in the wilderness; but though distributed among the same collectors as the previous chapters, presents no features calling for remark.

Before passing we notice the employment of the Divine names from the beginning of the book.

Chapter i. It is simply "Moses the servant of Jehovah," and "*Jehovah* spake to Joshua"; and where there is direct address —"Jehovah *thy* God," "*your* God."

Chapter ii. Rahab, in speaking of Israel's God, can only use the name *Jehovah*, as the one which report has made so familiar—speaking of Him once as *your God*, who she is sure, from the events at the Red Sea and afterwards, is "God in heaven above and the earth beneath."

Chapters iii. iv. The usual term is still *Jehovah*, with the addition *your God* when called for, as well as "the *Living God*" (Deut. v. 26), and "the Lord" (Adonai) "of the whole earth."

Chapter v. calls for nothing but *Jehovah*.

Thus we can see so far that there is no sign of diverse

authorship in the use of the names, but the most simple possible adaptation of them to each case. "The *Lord* of all the earth" is found here for the first time, and not again till Zephaniah and Zechariah, but is peculiarly appropriate in Joshua, where it was important to emphasize the view, on this the first occasion of Israel's proceeding thus to claim what belonged to their God.

Chapter vi. is given over to J E. As to whether there be any marks of 'composition' besides, the question is said to be 'difficult,' and for the discussion of it we are referred to Wellhausen and Kuenen. Upon this we only say that such a story could never have afforded to wait so long for an author. It seems almost as fit to talk of a man's photograph being taken from the shadow that fell from him a year ago. Such a picture as the taking of Jericho, or the materials of it, floating down the current till the J E date, conflicts too harshly with all laws of history and mind. If there was no one in Joshua's day who thought the story worth writing, we may be sure there was no one to fill the blank 500 years after. And if there was any one then impelled to the attempt through the influence of some lingering tradition, how was he to go about it? The very idea is out of the question. If we cannot positively name the author, we can see him at least as a contemporary. And if not himself an eye-witness, he must get the story, as Froissard did his chronicles, from those that were. But we cannot well suppose the old Hebrew to have the genius of a Froissard, who had the art of learning all that could be learned, and forgetting nothing. So that even *he* would have been nowhere for his work 500 years after Joshua. And then think what the writer of the fall of Jericho had to do. Cressy, Poitiers, Agincourt, Bannockburn, were nothing to this. Such a thing had never been done, and never dreamt of. The very conception of it had to be made, as of a new God's-work on earth. It was a novel sort of drama, an unheard-of

tragedy, which it required *mind* to originate far higher than any 'criticism' can tell us of. And to go through such a matter in such a style, without one trait of either meanness or magniloquence—nothing wanting and nothing redundant; no desire to make either more or less than enough of Joshua, priests, or people; so to paint that bold, quiet circling of the city day after day, with the cowering of the Canaanite warriors inside, till in a moment the mighty wall fell flat, and every Israelite walked straight in; and all this in a simpler style than we can now write of it—this is not the manner of a 'Composition' 500 years after date. And yet this is only a part of the drama; for that first Act of it, in the spying of the ground, is at least as remarkable as any military reconnaissance, and told with the same simplicity and force of truth as what followed is. And a second Act is that strange passage of the Jordan, in which, without a tinge of superstition, the ark, with its priestly bearers, is for the first time brought forward on such a stage, ending with that advance solemn as a temple procession, all having the one meaning—"They got not the land in possession by their own sword, neither did their own arm save them: but Thy right hand, and Thine arm, and the light of Thy countenance, because thou hadst a favour unto them." In the attempt to explain all this as an 8th century concoction we can only see that 'criticism' has forgot itself.

Just one word here as to the antiquity of this book. It seems from verse 26 that Jericho was still unbuilt. And yet, long before the date assigned by the critics to the book, it is spoken of as having been rebuilt by Hiel, the Bethelite, when Joshua's prophecy was fulfilled. (1 Kings xvi. 26.)

Chapters vii.–ix. These are still divided among the same composers. The first thing observable in them is the evidence of Jericho's having fallen. The next thing is the strict impartiality with which the faults of Israel are told; and this impartiality reflects a strong light on the account of unbroken

success that had preceded. In Israel there has now been disobedience and rashness. In Jehovah alone has been perfect faithfulness and righteousness; and Israel, though sinning and suffering, has well learned from the righteousness of Jehovah. If moral balance could prove anything as to the integrity of the narrative, it proves it here. And it would be one of the difficulties of the new 'criticism' to carry that with so even a hand down the ages till J E, and beyond them.

Chapter vii. Here we have Achan's sin, with the disaster that followed; and more than that, the unbelieving dejection of Joshua, making him more ready to reflect upon his God than to suspect his people. "Wherefore hast Thou brought us over Jordan to deliver us to the Amorites?" &c. "Would we had been content, and dwelt on the other side Jordan." After this comes the judgment upon the offender, and the restoration of Israel. Let us not forget that the valley of Achor is a topic warmly taken up by Hosea (chap. ii. 11). But Hosea was long before any of the 'collectors.'

Chapter viii. Now, in regard to the stratagem by which Ai was taken, it is not for us to question its propriety. Only it seems a remarkable sequel to the taking of Jericho.

As to the journey to mount Ebal for the setting up of the altar, it is assumed to be out of its place here, as what could not have been done till the intervening country was subdued. Now observe, there is no mark of time to indicate that the thing was done *now*, only the *notice* that *it was done*. But, supposing that it *was* done now. There are two things that might well have contributed to that: one is the present paralysis of the Canaanite mind, combined with the positive order of Moses to have this altar set up at once. "When ye be gone over Jordan"; yes, "On the day when ye shall pass over Jordan ye shall set up these stones." (Deut. xxvii. 2, 4.) No wonder, then, that Joshua was in haste about the work. It was important for the sake of each subsequent step. He might well, then, trust his God for the present. And who can

say that he did not act with as much prudence as at Ai in providing by a rear guard against danger from behind?

Chapter ix. *The treaty with the Gibeonites.* The great point for us here, in estimating the moral evidence for the integrity of the narrative, is the honest telling how the people erred in "not asking counsel at the mouth of the Lord." This, however, only brings out to greater advantage the character of the princes for their rare integrity.

Chapter x. 1–14. The difficulty here would be the narrative of the extraordinary miracle. Now, we can imagine three ways in which men of entire faith and devoutness may take this.

(*a*) One may say, "I accept it, in common with millions gone before, as a perfectly literal statement of a Divine act, by which the sun was kept from setting for a great part of a day."

(*b*) Another says, "This, to my mind, is a poetical way of telling how Joshua expressed the wish or prayer that the day might not end till he had finished the work in hand, and that his desire was granted in special power given him for the purpose."

(*c*) Another may say, "My objection is simply that the book of Jasher is long subsequent to the book of Joshua, and I am not able to accept the later as any part of the earlier."

Verses 15–37. *Hebron.* The capture of it, in connection with Caleb, as at chap. xiv. 6–14.

Now, from this portion has been framed a heavy charge against the integrity of the book, for it is argued that there are two captures of Hebron related, and, of course, by different authors. Now our object is to show that the various notices make up one perfect chain, with five links, furnishing a strong argument for the unity of the whole. The chain simply comes to us in the narrative, with the link that is mentioned second, preceding the *actual* second, which occupies the fourth place.

The links are these: chaps. x. 15, 36; xi. 21, 22; xiv. 6–14; xv. 13, 14. Or thus:

(1) The return to Gilgal after the defeat of the five kings.

(2) The capture of Hebron after the second pursuit and the destruction of the kings.

(3) An additional motive of Joshua's destroying the Anakims from Hebron.

(4) Caleb's application to go against Hebron.

(5) Notice of Hebron as Caleb's portion in his tribe.

Commencing with (2), the capture of Hebron was Joshua's work, as commander-in-chief. But that does not mean that no particular captain had that work assigned to *him*, and none so likely as Caleb to be the one, from its special difficulty. Anyhow, the *destruction was complete*. "They took it, and smote it with the edge of the sword, and the king thereof, and all the cities thereof, and all the souls that were therein; he left none remaining, but destroyed it utterly, and all the souls that were therein." Nothing can be more definite. And as showing the importance of Hebron over the two other cities of the league here mentioned, Eglon and Lachish, it is added, "*all the cities thereof, and the king thereof.*" For between the present moment and the departure of the former king for the siege of Gibeon a successor had come in.

The next link is No. 3 (xi. 21, 22). It comes in as a summary, or parallel statement of what had taken place. And it is equally definite in the view which it gives of the entire destruction of Hebron, and its great importance as the centre of Anakim power, which would involve its headship over other cities. "At that time came Joshua, and cut off the Anakims from the mountains, from Hebron, from Debir, from Anab, and from all the mountains of Judah . . . . Joshua destroyed them utterly with their cities. There was none of the Anakims left in the land of the children of Israel: only in Gaza, in Gath, and in Ashdod, there remained."

Now it is very clear that this is a re-assertion of the capture

of Hebron, with the entire destruction of its people, as including many Anakim. It is in vain to speak of it as a second capture—as if, meanwhile, the expelled Anakim had returned. All that is said about them is that none of them remained in *Hebron*, only in *Philistia*. Not a word of their escaping from Hebron to that, much less of their returning thence to Hebron. All that is contrary to the record.

The next link is No. 4, in chap. xiv. 6–14, and here comes in for the first time the action of Caleb. Hebron, according to this notice, had not yet been taken, and Caleb is ambitious to be the taker. But why keep that back till now? Because it is now that the inheritance is being marked out for Judah, and *this* is the most prominent feature of it. Hence the writer, having the whole before him, reserves the remarkable step of Caleb for this as its most fitting place. See how it commences. "The children of Judah came to Joshua in Gilgal." And when should that be but just on the return to the camp at Gilgal, after the flight of the five kings? (x. 15.) To proceed against Hebron earlier had not been in the plan. But now is the time, when its king is a fugitive, and so, if Caleb would have his desire gratified and his faith realised, he must move at once. Hence his word, "Thou knowest the thing that Jehovah said unto Moses concerning thee and me in Kadesh-barnea. . . . And Moses sware on that day, Surely the land whereon thy feet have trodden shall be thine inheritance. . . . Now therefore give me this mountain, whereof the Lord spake in that day; for thou heardest in that day how the Anakims were there, and that the cities were great and fenced. If so be Jehovah be with me, then shall I be able to drive them out, as the Lord said." So "Joshua blessed him, and gave him Hebron for an inheritance."

Now nothing can be more life-like than this appeal to Joshua, or more appropriate than its introduction here. If tone could tell of truth, this surely does; and all the more that Caleb is so positively declaring the Divine word, as he

assumes it to be still remembered. If, then, this Anakim mountain was really promised, why should he not claim it, and claim it now? It is not a moment too late, though it is five-and-forty years ago. For Caleb's strength is what it was then. But it is now or never. And who so fit to uproot these giants as the man who had so boldly declared, "We are well able to overcome it"? It would be a mistake if this prime conquest should pass into other hands. And yet plainly it is the pen of truth, and not merely the author of "Joshua," that tells it all. What, then, shall we say of this collocation of sentences that so binds up this appeal with Joshua's return to Gilgal—which we shall call the first link in the chain—just between the first and the second movement against the king of Hebron? Is this nothing better than the pitiful dislocation which we are now asked to believe?

And if this, the petition for Hebron, was the first link in the chain of notices about it, and the first reference to Judah's inheritance, what shall we think of the one that closes up the whole? "Unto Caleb he gave a part among the children of Judah, even the city of Arba, the father of Anak, which is Hebron. And Caleb drove thence the three sons of Anak—Sheshai, Ahiman, and Talmai." ["Drove thence," as being = dispossessed and took their place, is much more correctly given as "*destroyed*" by the Sept. and Vulg. For that, as we find throughout, was the *mode* of the dispossessing.]

Passing over for the present the conquest of Canaan, we come to the return of the two-and-a-half tribes to their homes, with the erection of the altar by the way.

Now this seems to be altogether an original account of a very singular event. If it is not true, it is not worthy of attention, except, in the interest of truth, to prove its falseness. But if true, it can never be shown how such nice particulars either escaped the disintegrating action of centuries, or were discovered, after such an interval, as an addition to

the story. As to D^2 and his fancied share in the passage, it is certainly a novel style of historical composition—first to conjure up a D in Josiah's time to make a "Deuteronomy," and then a D^2 to imitate him for the making of a "Joshua." That would be to solve certain supposed difficulties by evoking the shadow of a shade.

Now the first thing that appears is, that these tribes have patiently remained in Canaan while their services were wanted. But this being so no longer, they are returning to their homes. The parting displays entire mutual satisfaction, Joshua's words being equally full of honest commendation and faithful admonition.

What follows is worthy of our attention down to the smallest minutiæ. The geographical notices, to begin with, are more in the style of an original occupant, than of one whose people have been naturalized for centuries. "They departed from Shiloh, *which is in the land of Canaan*. . . . And came to the borders of Jordan, *which are in the land of Canaan* . . . and there they built an altar." Hearing of this, the congregation is confounded, assembles at Shiloh, and breathes war on the spot against the supposed offenders. On second thoughts, however, they begin with an embassy, and that begins with an accusation, assuming, without a word of enquiry, that the act is one of flagrant rebellion. Yes, and the charge is from "the whole congregation of Jehovah"—"What trespass is this that ye have committed?" And they speak as those who had not only heard of Baalpeor, but had seen it and felt it, and were still smarting under the stroke. "Is the iniquity of Peor too little for us . . . that *ye* will turn this day from following the Lord? and seeing *ye* rebel to-day against the Lord, to-morrow He will be wroth with the whole congregation." The emphasis is observable, and the repetition of it remarkable. The first *ye* is in connection with the *Peor* sinners, and the second with the whole congregation. It seems an unambiguous mark of originality. Nor must Achan's offence be passed over. This

also is pressed. And now the accused, having calmly heard it all, answer as calmly, "Jehovah, the God of gods, *He* knoweth, and Israel *he* shall know [emphasis again, as greatly needed]; if it be in rebellion that we have built this altar." 'No, it is with no view to burnt-offering, meat-offering, peace-offering, or sacrifice that we have done this. Our one purpose is still to offer these "*at the altar of Jehovah our God, which is before the tabernacle.*" Our present action has an entirely different object. And so, before we had got the Jordan betwixt you and us, we set up this altar as the exact pattern of the Shiloh one, looking straight towards your own Canaan. It is union, not separation from you, that we seek; and this altar before your eyes is the witness of the fellowship. Your altar is our altar. And this pattern is to intimate to our children that not in Gilead but in Canaan is the centre of our worship. Thither only can we ever take, as Moses commanded us, our burnt-offerings and sacrifices.' How then, after hearing this, can Phinehas but be well-pleased with a people so loyal to Moses? Both parties, in short, have erred. The one in doing, without any notice, a most suspicious thing; the other in not calmly inquiring, but rashly accusing. And now both are satisfied. But the very faults of each indicate unmistakably the date of the story. That fresh, not to say furious zeal, on the national side, belonged to that age, not to a remote posterity. The talk about exterminating the offenders (*v.* 22; Deut. xiii. 15) was that of the conquerors of Canaan, not of the contemporaries of any J. E. D^2 or P. And that ardent attachment, on the other hand, of the trans-Jordanic settlers to the Shiloh worship, that passionate abjuration of the thought of schism, belongs to the present moment, not to any distant time. It is easy to say that the collectors of the tale saw all this, and accommodated their narrative to it. Rather let it be said that such a genius for the avoiding of anachronisms by transferring oneself from the present into the past, and not only painting but breathing the reality, is not the style of such collectors. They knew

Joshua's age little better than Joshua knew theirs. And so we will believe that it is to him, not to them, that we are indebted for this life-like picture of a very remarkable business. It is safe to conclude in such a case that only he who has lived through the circumstances can so depict them.

After this decisive evidence for an early and direct original, it will naturally be difficult to make out a case for a late and indirect source. Hence, while verses 1–6 are given to D^2, 7 and 8 "are of uncertain origin, but by a later hand." As to 9–34 the "source is also uncertain. The phraseology is in the main P, but not throughout in his characteristic style." All this is not to be wondered at if the whole search is on a wrong field.

Chapter xxiii. Here is the first of the two closing addresses of Joshua, being assigned by the critics to D^2. That is to say, Joshua is said to have thus spoken, while it is understood that he did not. Neither himself nor any of his contemporaries was able, or, if able, willing, to hand down what he said; nor do we know anything about it but what this late compositor has told us, who presumably made use of certain fragments of information which had come in his way.

This D^2, then, makes a 'long time' to have elapsed since the 'rest' implied in chapter xxii. And now Joshua calls a general assembly of the people to hear what he has on his mind. He then points them to a land truly won from the Canaanites, and in a condition of real quiet. Still there is much to be done. Of the old inhabitants many remain, entailing an imminent danger of Israel's seduction into sin, and the loss of all they have gained. As yet, however, there has been no defection, no unfaithfulness, only feebleness, temptation, and danger. And all this, we are told, is put by the writer into Joshua's mouth ages after the temptation has given way to gross sin, and the danger to disastrous havoc; and yet Joshua is not betrayed for a moment into a word showing that

he knew anything about it. "Know for a certainty" (he is made to say) "that the Lord your God will no more drive out," &c. (*v.* 13); and all the time the risk had turned into stern reality, and the remaining Canaanites had become the very "scourges and thorns" spoken of. But Joshua is, with entire consistency, made to be ignorant of it all. Now this is very perfect, but it is just too perfect; for, as matters have ever gone in this world, such utter absence of anachronism should not, and could not, have been; such absolute truth in Joshua, to both fact and feeling; such perfection, in short, of the Joshua character—this picture could never have come from any D^2 working on such lines. It is precisely what we know that Joshua should have said from what we now know *that he did say*, but what no D^2 could have thus made him say. It required a living Joshua, such as we have him in our Pentateuch and here, to give the present address with all its intensity and delicacy of feeling, all its quietness and vigour of action, all its melting love for Israel and their God. It is, to the life and letter, the old man who had gone through the whole, who had received all the promises quoted, and could appeal to the people in so searching a style: "Ye know in all your hearts, and in all your souls, that not one thing hath failed of all the good things which the Lord your God spake concerning you," &c.—*while yet so much did seem to have failed.* Else, why those Canaanites still in the midst? It required an actual Joshua both to see these, and yet that not one thing had failed, for he well knew the conditionality of the Divine engagements, and that by this their fulfilment must be estimated. As to the matter of faith, Israel had failed, and hence, in the occupation of the land, they were not where they might have been. Besides which, there was the express condition not to drive out the inhabitants all at once. Thus as to the Divine engagement, fairly viewed, there was no failure, and Israel knew that; and as the foe has never yet lifted up his head since his overthrow, so he never would

any more, but should disappear altogether if only Israel proved true to Jehovah.

Chapter xxiv. Let us see what this portion says of itself, and what 'Criticism' says of it.

It says that it is the second closing address of Joshua to his people, for the sake of conveying to them a direct message from the Divine mouth. Thus, instead of merely reporting the message, he keeps up the Divine communication in the first person. The word is purely from Jehovah to Israel, being a minute rehearsal of what He had done for them. (*vv.* 2–13.) Upon this Joshua founds a short exhortation to obedience, and the people, after some interchange of sentiments with him, frankly and fully enter into his mind. (*vv.* 14–25.) This, which in the first part is professedly as divine as the Decalogue, ends in a manner as significant of stability—"Joshua wrote all these words in the book of the law of God, and took a great stone, and set it up there under an oak, that was by the sanctuary of the Lord. And said, Behold, this stone shall be a witness unto us; for it hath heard all the words of the Lord which He spake to us. . . . So Joshua let the people depart, every man to his inheritance." (*vv.* 26–28.)

Now what all this means is plain enough, but then, according to modern 'Criticism,' it is not true. Joshua conveyed no such communication to Israel, nor do we know one word that he did convey. We have simply a writing, said — with trifling exceptions — to have come from E centuries afterwards — drawn from what sources we know not, only not the word of Joshua. What value there is in his words we cannot tell; we only know that besides certain smaller, but still suspicious, matters he erred in speaking of the "two kings of the Amorites" (*v.* 12), for that "should certainly have been *twelve*, with the *Septuagint;*" and "even that disagrees with the thirty-one kings of chapter xii. 24."

It seems, then, that these words were neither spoken nor

written by Joshua; but E says that they were, and that is now the 'critical' proof that they were not. What shall we believe then? What can we believe, so long as we have to do with an impersonality like this telling us what we cannot imagine that he believed himself? The thing amounts, in short, not to belief, but to the burlesque of it.

Looking a little further into this matter, there are certain things that we can well imagine; others not. Thus we can suppose (1) the God of Israel addressing His people directly by Joshua's mouth instead of merely sending a message in the third person. They were now being launched upon an entirely new future, as this their last honoured leader was leaving them; and we can well suppose that their Divine Guide should now choose this mode of sending them such a communication, but we cannot imagine that in the total absence of such reality, this compositor should give so very novel a shape to his own ideas, or to a floating tradition of some such address, or to anything that we can think of as his ground-work. And if we can overlook the questionable morality of his using the Divine name to stamp his own ideas, we are still in difficulty. For (2) we can imagine the God of Israel, who had chosen and led this people, and still claimed them for His own, as choosing a simple recital of His past action as the most effective style of appeal; but we cannot so imagine our E as getting hold of the mere shadow of the facts and putting it into this peculiar shape. The recital in Jehovah's mouth had great power, but from the scribe's pen, centuries afterwards, it was worse than worthless.

Then the question would be, How was E so familiar with those details? To us the first are well known from our Genesis. But it is P and J that supply them. (Gen. xi. 27, 31, 32; xii. 1–6.) And how did E know them so well? Nor was this even the language in which they had been told at the first, but such a modification of it as the Great Acter might adopt at last. Abraham had, indeed, "looked" over the land, and

"walked through" it, and "dwelt" in it, and been promised it as his inheritance. But the language is now peculiarly realistic, and exactly suits the view of its being Jehovah's direct word. "*I* took your father Abraham from the other side of the flood, and led him throughout all the land of Canaan." It looks exactly like what it professes to be, but not the least like what 'criticism' takes it for. It looks like the direct word of the Great Sovereign, seeking to bring home to Israel's mind, in the most living manner, the fact of His living agency; but not at all like that catching at cold tradition in the feeble manner which we can alone associate with E. For it was needful that he should first frame the conception of the style, and then should reach the execution of it in this divine manner, neither of which we are able to suppose. And what would have been his object? None that we can imagine, whereas in the actual case we can see that to the full.

There are some special objections from this chapter which should be noticed here. Thus we are told, as already mentioned, that "in verse 12, twelve, instead of two, should be read with Sept." But why so, if, as we are also told, that too would be a mistake?

Then, "the context of verse 12 requires imperatively a reference to some event *subsequent* to the capture of Jericho, so that the two kings of the Amorites are here out of place." But why so? Is it not competent to go back a step, for the sake of specialising them, as the first instance of the action of the hornets? But "they have been already noticed in verse 8, and are here out of place." That very notice, we answer, just puts them in their right place here. For *that* is a *full account* of them—*this* a mere reference, with a special view, to what was said before.

Again, "This retrospect differs in some respects from the previous narrative, and mentions incidents not otherwise recorded, *e.g.* the worship of 'other gods' beyond the Euphrates

(*vv.* 2, 14); the *war* of Balak with Israel (*v.* 9); the lords (or citizens) of Jericho *fighting* against Israel (*v.* 11)." And why not this difference? Why may not the divine mouth utter here some things not mentioned before? Does not this rather confirm the fact of the portion being an original divine address? And then, when we think what the new points are. First, there is the worship of 'other gods' by Israel's ancestors. Why not mention that here? Was it not true, as proved by the relics, probably secret, of idolatry still remaining among the people? And if true, was it not most fit to expose it? And who should do that more properly than the All-seeing One, who was thus mocked? Then comes "*the war with Balak.*" But no such thing, it is said, had been mentioned in the history as that "Balak arose and warred against Israel." And had he not? Had he not assembled his army with this very view, until, upon second thoughts, it seemed better to try sorcery and seduction?

Lastly, the lords (or citizens) of Jericho fought with Israel. And strange indeed if they let Israel walk into their city through the fallen walls without a desperate effort to keep them out. Such are the objections. But wonderfully like a new and very original speaker the matters objected to are.

Note on Judges, chapter i. The events in 1–7 happened, it is said, after the death of Joshua, and are here told for the first time. The taking of Jerusalem (*v.* 8) is a prior event, and told in Joshua xv. 63. This then being taken as a landmark, certain things are repeated in connection with it, such as the taking of Hebron by Caleb, which is merely alluded to, having been fully told in Joshua xiv. 1–15 and xv. 13, 14. With that goes the taking of Debir by Othniel. (*vv.* 15–19.) *And that is repeated here.* No more can be, and no less need be, said.

APPENDIX.

ON THE ALLEGED "PECULIARITIES OF P."

THE following seems long, but is of much importance in the present argument. It takes up an extensive set of passages—under fifty heads, as given by Dr. Driver from the critics—with a view of proving that 'P,' their author, did not live earlier than Ezekiel. Our object is to show that this argument is without validity; or, in other words, to examine a large collection of the fruit which we have already spoken of as *without a root.*

(No. 1.) This is that P "uses 'Elohim,' instead of 'Jehovah,' from Genesis i. 1 to Exodus vi. 2, *uniformly* with two exceptions"; all the passages being supposed to present enough of his specialties. It will be a question, of course, how these passages came into P's possession, *with* the distinctive marks; or, if *without*, how he came to affix them. And it is a hard task for the imagination to conceive how—either by tradition or document—the passages kept coming down so regularly all the way from Adam.

Another question would be, How P comes to be credited with so much in Genesis, with no vestige of a priestly trait. If such was his original *character*, why refrain so long from the exercise of it? It is easy to say that he chose to begin with the origin of humanity as his introduction to the origin of Israel and priesthood. And so might any author plead his right to begin from Adam.

Again, if P was only 'Elohistic' to Exodus vi. 2, why alter then? Did the name 'Elohim' signify so little that he could lay it down as an old vestment? For, as 'Jehovah' was certainly the name connected with priestly work, the question is how the author of the P. C. kept clear of it for such a time. Of all his badges that was the essential one; and yet he could go without it so long, and then take it up without being recognised one whit the better. The original name, indeed, was still the great Creation name and World name, and would continue needful in many cases as heretofore. But *the great Elohist* gives it up, now and for ever, and must henceforth be sought for from the use of 'Jehovah.' The old name on the contrary, is now a badge of E, the *minor Elohist*—who, seeing that *Elohistic* work did not stop at Sinai, retains his familiar term for recounting that—leaving all that was *Jehovistic* to the *new* Jehovist P, and the old one J.

It is clear, however, that the new '*Jehovah*' revelation must have made a vivid impression upon P, for he, by laying down the old name, showed how fully he appreciated the new; and as he was at last to give out a real 'Priest's Code,' he well knew that legislation of that sort demanded the 'Jehovah' name. And he felt equally that that was the only style in which Moses could be allowed to relate such matters as the Divine judgments on Pharaoh.

This brings us to the startling admission of what he did twice while still wearing his original badge; for it was his "uniform practice," we are told, to use 'Elohim' instead of 'Jehovah,' "except at Genesis xvii. 1 and xxi. 1." But why '*except*'? It was as a matter of *strict principle* that he did this. Never before had he (the P of the Critics) any Jehovistic *matter* to deal with. Now he has, and therefore calls in the Name, for it certainly *was Jehovah* that appeared on these occasions. Hence he was now writing of 'Jehovah' dealings as formerly of 'Elohim' ones. Hence therefore his changed language. And if this be the key to these two

passages in Genesis, it is equally so to passages innumerable. It explains all, and is enough to explode the critical theory; for all that follows displays simply the same principle; and to apply to the two texts the word 'except' is only to mask our ignorance.*

(No. 2.) The word *min*, kind, as *after his kind*, in Genesis, Leviticus, Deuteronomy. All the Genesis passages occur in the Creation and Flood narratives, these being strictly *Elohistic*. In Lev. xi. the subject is *forbidden food*, being thus a branch of *Jehovah* legislation. The same occurs nine times in Deut. xiv., contrary, as that is, to the new criticism, for the author of that is said to be D, more than a century before P; and who, drawing upon J E for his materials and language, should have known nothing of P's 'peculiarities.' But he did know this—however he got it. And thus we are set on the road to the conclusion that the author of Deuteronomy is the author of Leviticus.

(No. 3, 4.) "Swarm, swarming things," as in the same narratives in Genesis. Then, in the Jehovah *legislation* of Lev. xi. and the Jehovah *action* in Exodus viii. we have the same expressions, and all in P. Hence, it is argued, his isolation as an author. Now it is not strange that phrases

* The view here insisted on Dr. Driver thinks to answer by asking, "Whether it be more probable that an inference dependent on an *abundance* of criteria throughout the whole Pentateuch should be a mistaken one; or that the Compiler, or even Scribe, should twice have substituted the more usual 'Jehovah' for 'Elohim,' under the influence of the verses preceding? To this question there can surely be but one answer." Now this, it will be seen, does not touch our argument, for our view is that *the matter in hand* obliged the writer to use 'Jehovah' in these two cases—leaving no room for mistake in the *scribe*, any more than it allows of '*exceptions*' in the author. And, as to the latter point, it would be an interesting question how P fell upon the wrong word.

occurring so seldom should be found in such places, nor that the same writer should treat them first as *Elohistic*, then as *Jehovistic*, when *Creation* had given place to *Legislation*.

Already, then, these two cases, with the two exceptions in Genesis, settle much. They show that P could use either name as occasion required. It is the new atmosphere into which he has been introduced that has made the change. And a most effective thing is this atmosphere in drawing out language, for it can inspire a single author with the power for doing different things, without handing over every separate piece of work to a new author.

(No. 5.) "Be fruitful and multiply." (Gen. i. 28; xxviii. 35.) In the first case the expression applies to the human race, as Elohim's creation; in the second to the covenant people, as belonging to El Shaddai, who is the same as Jehovah.

(No. 6.) For food (le'och-la), Genesis to Leviticus. The word is used in *legislation*, and hence it falls to the now Jehovistic P. But Ezekiel employs it oftener even than the Pentateuch, which is much valued as showing its date. And yet it brings out something entirely different; for Ezekiel never uses the expression, like the Pentateuch, of *human food*, but of *fuel* for the fire, or *prey* of beasts. And this is just the change that a later age would exhibit.

(No. 7.) *Toldoth*, "Generations." Thus (*a*) "These are the generations of." Now observe the means used for getting to the conclusion that this belongs to P. Genesis ii. 4 is thus broken up, "These are the generations of the heavens and earth when they were created" (P); "In the day that Jehovah-Elohim created," &c. (J.) An impartial reader will find it hard to think that this division is not made just for the purpose of giving the last clause to a new author. Again, chapter xi. 1–9 is all J, when P abruptly steps in at verse 10 with "gener-

ations of Shem." This continues down to verse 27, so as just to include another *tol'-doth*, even while unsparingly breaking up the notice of *Haran*, J taking up the second part of him in verse 28, just as if the "generations of Terah" had no right to belong to the same portion.

Then, "generations of Isaac" (chap. xxv. 19) is said to be by the Elohistic P, although the immediate connection is all with *Jehovah*. (*vv.* 21–23.) The next cases, Esau and Ishmael, as simply human, are truly Elohistic. That of Jacob in xxxvii. 2 is assumed to be the same, in spite of his real connection being with *El Shaddai*. And, more than that, the first part of verse 2 is given to P as having "generations" in it! while the second part onward is assigned to E! And what after all does "generations" here mean but '*family history*,' as Gesenius makes it?

(*b*) "*Otherwise*—Gen. x. 32; xxv. 13; Exod. vi. 16, 19; xxviii. 10; Numb. i. 12 times."

Now mark these cases. Gen. x. 32. This is assumed as Elohistic, just after the reference to *Shem*, whose God was *Jehovah*. The next case is *Ishmael*, clearly *Elohistic*. Then Exodus vi. 16 Levi is, of course, *Jehovistic*, and so the tribes in xxviii. 10; Numb. i.

So much for this peculiarity of P—his fondness for genealogies. And this may truly be said, so long as, whenever a genealogy appears, it is handed over to him.

(No. 8.) "To expire" (*gava*), "a peculiar word." Now we can see at once it is a very old word with a strong meaning. The first case of it is in a Divine utterance to Noah, telling how universal life was to *perish* (Gen. vi. 17) with the chronicler's account of the fulfilment. (vii. 21.) The next use of the word is in the solemn notices of the deaths of Abraham, Isaac, Ishmael, and Jacob, where it is apparently taken from the register of deaths. Then in Numbers xvii. 12, 13; xx. 3, we have the word four times as expressing extreme excitement—

"We perish, we all perish," &c. It is thus a word of great force reserved for rare occasions. Which is more likely, then, that the word was used as mentioned? or that a certain scribe, finding certain traditions or documents many centuries after, affixed the word to them as what he thought would be suitable? One thing at least can hardly be denied. The strong sentences in question are more fit for the 'lively style' of J than for the 'prosaic' P. The features are misplaced by applying them to the latter. And more than that, the word, as elsewhere used in Job, Psalms, Jeremiah, Zechariah (never in Ezekiel), is purely *poetical.* Thus it well suits the view presented of its antiquity by the Pentateuch, but not that of the 'critical' theory.

(No. 9.) Mē-ath (=100) "in construct state, where ordinarily the simple mē-a would be said." (DRIVER gives just two exceptions to this use by P—Genesis xvii. 17; xx. 1.) It is just the difference between a hundred *of men* and a hundred *men.* Now it is true that, in the Pentateuchal portions called 'P,' the unusual form (mē-ath) occurs twenty-seven times against two of the other. And from this it might be supposed that 'P' does not otherwise use the form mē-a at all. But it is not so. For several times he does use it, in the expressions 100 *in, from* (=our *of*), as Exodus xxix. 9, 18, xxxviii. 9, 11; Leviticus xxvi. 8 *bis;* cf. Exodus xxvii. 11.

Thus then we would state the matter. In the Pentateuch the *usual form* is mē-ath, a *hundred of. But after this* that form went entirely out,* and the other took its place. This post-Pentateuch usage embraces Joshua, Judges, 1 and 2 Samuel, 1 and 2 Kings, 1 and 2 Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Amos, Esther. How then came P by his *me-ath?* It was not used in *his* time. And thus it turns out, by the inevitable logic of fact, that there is no room here for any sixth century collector;

* DRIVER gives only three cases of its continuance—2 Chronicles xxv. 9; Esther i. 4, and (probably corrupt) Nehemiah v. 11.

for the word, so common before Joshua, suddenly disappears, leaving none to claim it but Moses himself.

(No. 10.) "*With thee*" (him, &c.) appended to an enumeration, 24 times. Thus Genesis vi. 18, "Come into the ark, thou, and thy sons *with thee*"; and vii. 7, "Noah went in," &c. Here then we have what professes to be a Divine mandate in certain terms, and its fulfilment in the same. Now we can understand the one as the order of a ruler, and the other as the writer's statement of obedience; but we cannot understand either as having found its way from Noah to P (without occurring anywhere outside the Pentateuch), some 1700 years afterwards, whether in this state, or as so presented by him. Of still less importance seems the next statement—that 'seed' is followed in 11 cases by "*after you.*" For what more natural than to make this addition to a promise to anyone and his seed?

(No. 11.) "*And Noah did according to all that God commanded him.*" (Genesis vi. 22.) "Exactly the same form of sentence in Exodus vii. 6, and about eleven cases more." Now it is little wonder that this style occurs as it does, after such matters have been so given up to one author, as to leave little room for any other; and yet no sooner is an opening made, as in the very next sentence, than the same style is carried on. Thus chapter vii. 1: "Jehovah said to Noah, Come thou into the ark. . . . And" (*v.* 5) "*Noah did according to all that Jehovah commanded him.*" The fact is, this style is neither P nor J, but simply Hebrew. And it is substantially the same with human commands as divine. (Joshua iv. 5, 8, xi. 23; Genesis l. 12, with xlviii. 30; Exodus xvi. 17; 2 Kings xi. 9; xvi. 16; Esther iv. 16, 17, viii. 9; Deut. v. 32; 2 Chron. xiv. 14, 16; 2 Samuel xxiv. 18, 19; Exodus xxiii. 15.) It is, in a word, the Old Testament style.

(No. 12.) *This self-same day*—Genesis vii. 13, xvii. 23, 26; Exodus xii. 17, 41, 51; Leviticus xxiii. 14, 21, 28–30; Deut. xxxii. 48; Joshua v. 11, x. 27 ("not P"); Ezekiel ii. 3, xxiv. 2.

Beginning with Ezekiel, we grant to the critics that the expression was well known in the age of 'P.' And this they should equally grant to us that it is used *in the same manner.*

How then does Ezekiel use it? Always as a strong expression for specialty and emphasis. Thus, chapter ii. 3, it is the fifth day of the fourth month in the thirtieth year, when the divine utterance is, "They have transgressed against Me till this very day." Now Ezekiel *knew this as true.* So chapter xxiv. 2. He knew the tenth day of the tenth month in the ninth year as *the very day* when Nebuchadnezzar laid siege to Jerusalem. Again, on the tenth day of the first month in the twenty-fifth year, "the hand of the Lord was upon him." Suppose now that 800 years after this a scribe had been gathering news about Ezekiel, and that he, knowing nothing of such facts, had used this language about them. What then? No, he neither would, nor, with any decency, could have done so. It was the actual situation, and that alone, which brought forth the words. These are the seal of reality, and as such we bless God for them. What, then, of the Mosaic passages? They bear precisely the same form, and yield the same proof of reality. The first is the *self-same day* that Noah entered the ark, being the seventeenth of second month in the year 600. And yet what critic believes it? If only they did, there would be no 'criticism' of this sort. So Abraham, getting the command to circumcise his household, carries it out, with all its inconvenience, on *the self-same day.* (Chaps. xvii. xxiii. xxvi.) But what critic believes it? The next is the Passover season (Exodus xii. 17, &c.), that self-same day when the 430 years were run out. How did P know that? or, not knowing, pretend it? And as it is the

fashion now not to believe *him*, we are led to ask, Did he believe himself? We are next brought to the self-same days of Passover and Atonement. (Leviticus xxiii.) Did P believe these as facts? Does the Critic now? Next comes Deut. xxxii. 48, which says that Jehovah told Moses on *the self-same day* of the Song, to get up mount Nebo and die, and yet Criticism allows no Song to Moses at all. Then Joshua v. 11 gives the *self-same day* of the new food, or the day after the Passover, which was the fourteenth of the first month, the manna ceasing on the day that followed. Now how did P come by news like that? And lastly we get (Joshua x. 27) the stones at the mouth of a certain cave, as being there *till this very day*. That however is said to be "not P," and yet it is the only case that he could really have ascertained. As to the others, he could know nothing, any more than ourselves, except from Moses.

(No. 13.) "*After their families.*" This occurs ninety-four times, mostly in Numbers and Joshua.

Here, again, we have the practice of counting words instead of weighing facts. Taking these, then, we can see that from the time of Abraham it was the practice to record families. We see next what this had grown to at the death of Joseph, and then at the birth of Moses. During the Egyptian period it was the bond that kept the slaves together, and at the end of it it was the corner-stone of the national existence. Hence the family-numbering by Moses and land-allotting by Joshua were fresh necessities. Never had a people such need of their *Domesday Book*. And as the record was essential, so the language was certain. It was simply the inevitable Hebrew style. As Moses had built on the Patriarchal reckoning—fact and style—so did Joshua upon Moses. And all the subsequent history on the two. Without it there was no Israel. And to relegate it all, whether act or record, to the age of P is simply—unthinkable.

(No. 14.) L'col, "as regards all, with a generalizing force = *namely, I mean*"—20 cases. This is specious, and must be examined.

Now the truth is that the term is used in the various senses which belong to the preposition, viz., *to, of, for, as to, up to all.* This last = *even*, which comes nearest to *namely.* And it is the sense of *up to* which gives this force.

"*Even.*" Only once does A. V. give this, Gen. xxiii. 10. In seven cases R.V. has it, as Gen. ix. 10, *up to, even* beast; Exodus xiv. 28, Even all the host; Leviticus xi. 42, Even all creeping things; xvi. 16, All their transgressions, even all their sins (which does not seem so Mosaic as *in*); Numbers xviii. 8, "The heave-offerings, even all their hallowed things" —which is questionably true. So *v.* 9, "Every oblation, *even* every meat-offering."

A common meaning is "as regards"; and where, as at the beginning of a sentence, "namely" is impossible. Thus Exodus xxvii. 3, 19, "As to all the vessels," &c. So in Numbers iv. 27 our versions are certainly right in saying, "In (= as to) all their burdens"; and verse 31, "According to all their service." So Exodus xxviii. 38, "In (as regards) all," &c. In Numbers v. 9 it is, "Every offering *of* the holy things"; and verse 18, "Keep the charge *for* all the service."

The remaining cases are miscellaneous. Exodus xxxvi. 1, "Wrought . . . according to," &c., is always the idea. Leviticus v. 3, "If he touch the uncleanness, whatever it be" (lit. *up to all*); xxii. 18, "For all his vows." A.V. "Whether it be any of." R.V. In Numbers iv. 38, "*With* instruments," could not be 'namely.' The last case is Ezekiel xliv. 9, "Of any stranger." A.V. and R.V. Cf. xx. 15, "The glory *of* all lands."

We may now see what is the value of the assertion that *l'col* in these places means "namely." And if it did the question would be how it found its way to P in that sense, or had the sense impressed by him.

To complete the case we add the following: Leviticus xi. 25, "As to every one who beareth . . . he shall wash"; xiv. 54, "This is the law for all plague"; Exodus xii. 26, "What must be eaten for every soul"; Genesis xlv. 1, "Before all"; Deut. xxxiv. 11, "In all the signs"; 2 Chron. xxxii. 27, "For shields, and for all jewels"; Esther x. 3, "Speaking peace to all his seed"; Eccles. x. 3, "He saith *to*, or *of*, every one"; Isaiah xxxviii. 16, "In all these things is the life"; lvi. 7, "For all people"; Jeremiah xiii. 7, "Not good for anything." Which uses certainly come much nearer to those in the Pentateuch than "*namely*."

(No. 15.) *An Everlasting Covenant.* What this had to do with P we do not know. But this we know, it is first a covenant with humanity (Gen. ix. 16), and therefore *Elohistic*. It is then a covenant with Abraham (xvii. 7), and takes the *Jehovah* character, after which all is of that order, whether with Israel in the gift of the Sabbath (Exodus xxxi. 16), or of the priesthood (Leviticus xxiv. 8; Numbers xviii. 19; xxv. 13). It was a sublime thing that the God of the whole earth, Jehovah, Abraham's God, should thus secure to His creatures such blessings by an indissoluble covenant. And, however *priestly* the record of it all might be, it was certainly not '*prosaic*.'

(No. 16.) B'mōdh m'ōdh—very exceedingly—"not the usual phrase." (Genesis xvii. 2, 6, 20; Exodus i. 7; Ezekiel ix. 13.) The critical theory is that the expression occurs for the first time in Ezekiel's age, when it became that of P. Not understanding this, let us look elsewhere. Now we have certain undisputed facts to go upon, and certain professed facts to go with them. The undisputed ones are—the coming of Messiah, and setting up of His Church; the general facts of Hebrew history, religion, and prophecy; together with the present state of the same people, as connected with the

professed prophecies in the Old and New Testaments. And the professed fact is that all this grew out of the call of Abraham. Now this was a new thing on the earth, and well deserved a new phrase, and that is "*very exceedingly.*" It is given as part of the Divine Communication to Abraham. Or take it, if you will, as the translation into human speech of the thought breathed out in that. If such, then it would naturally be put on record and handed down. Why should not Moses then get hold of it and fix it? And the other instance of it in the Pentateuch, though very different (Exodus i. 7), is all in fulfilment of the original engagement. At last the priest Ezekiel, meditating on the record day and night, hit upon the word and took it up. And having been deeply impressed by this "very exceedingly" of the blessing to his people, so he was moved by the "very exceedingly" of their rebellious treatment of it all. Here then we have certain great facts to build on, with a rational mode of building on them. This we can accept. But we can make nothing of the notion that P picked up the word and stamped it with his impress. It is not in a cold atmosphere like that that such burning language is learned. The "Bless thee very exceedingly" required a devout Abraham to hear, not a distant P to dream it. Besides which it is full of life, and would be out of place as a characteristic of the 'prosaic' P. Hence we conclude that, as we get more of religion and benefit in thus interpreting the word than by the 'critical' theory, so there is very much more of probability, reason, and historical principle.

(No. 17.) Substance (recosh). This is given as one of the peculiarities of P, and yet is followed by still more numerous cases from "not P." Such is our answer. And (18) the "cognate verb" may well go with it.

(No. 19.) "*Soul* in the sense of *person*" may be similarly dismissed, because of the remark, "A usage not confined to P,

but much more frequent in him than elsewhere." We cannot, however, make the issue depend upon the counting of the cases.

(No. 20.) "Generations, *your* and *their*" (dorotham, dorothechem) about forty times, and peculiar to P.

Now what is the fact as to this expression? Simply that—except in the promise to Abraham (Gen. xvii.)—it occurs only in prospective legislation. And, as all *that* is assigned to P, the expression, of course, goes along with it. That he should have happened to be the recorder of all such legislation—considering where he is said to have lived—is strange enough. But if that be so, the other is a part of it. Whether Moses kept repeating, "Throughout your generations," we may not know. But we know that P has written that he did! How far this was a characteristic or peculiarity of his we cannot tell, as the expression occurs nine times in the passage, Lev. xvii.–xxvi., which, we are told, is not by him.

(No. 21.) "Sojournings," with "land." Gen. xvii. 8; xxviii. 4; xxxvi. 7; xxxvii. 1; xlvii. 9; Exodus vi. 4; Ezek. xx. 38.

It is a beautiful chain, and has only to be inspected—beginning, as it does, with one very great fact. Abraham has just been called (Gen. xvii. 8), and has come into Canaan, to *sojourn* for the present in a land made over to him by Divine Covenant for himself and his seed. Now this Abraham would surely instil into Isaac, and Isaac into Jacob, till at last he sends him to Padan-aram, with a view to his returning and inheriting the land of his sojourn. (Gen. xxviii. 4.) It is a golden chain of family blessing such as never was known before. But now the family at least knows it; and the next link is that Jacob and Esau, having been *sojourning* in the land, have to part for want of room. (xxxvi. 7.) And this leads to the next fact. "Jacob dwelt in the land of his father's

sojourning, in the land of Canaan." (xxxvii. 1.) What more divine than to follow it all up with the engagement when the migrations were ended, "I have established My covenant with them, to give them the land of Canaan, wherein they were sojourners" (Exodus vi. 4)? The chain ends at last with one reference by Ezekiel to the old fact—if it be even as much. (xx. 38.)

As to the chain itself, it is perfect—beginning with the word to Abraham, as first commmunicated to Isaac, and then handed over to Jacob. Till, at last, *he* could be spoken of as "*dwelling* in the land of his father's sojournings." (xxxvii. 1.) Now the true criticism seems to be to look at these facts. For it is not, surely, in the days of Ezekiel that this chain has its origin. It is but a faint reflection of it at the most, that comes out then. The vital thing commences with Abraham, and culminates in Moses. This is the fact as developed in these few notices. And without reality the language was impossible. But this reality it was that gave rise to the experience in ages to come, "We are strangers and sojourners before thee, as were all our fathers."

We cannot proceed without noticing that the connection with P of the 'sojournings' in chap. xxxvii. 1 is made out, only by wrenching the verse from the other author to whom verse 2 belongs, all after the word 'Jacob.'

(No. 22.) *Possession* (Ahuzzah)—here is another chain, and this word also has a history. First, Canaan is promised to Abraham as an "everlasting *possession*." (Gen. xvii. 8.) In the belief of this Abraham secures a spot in it, as a *possession*, for the burying of Sarah. (xxiii. 4, 9, 20.) Then Jacob, after getting a temporary possession in Egypt, recounts to Joseph the promise of "*the everlasting possession*" (Gen. xlviii. 4); and, when dying, gives the order to lay him in the *family possession* at Mamre. (xlix. 30.) The execution of which is next told in the same terms. (l. 13.) Thus, then, had the fact of 'possession'

burnt itself into the bosom of the family. And, as such, it is told. But to relegate it to the sixth century, and fancy P as then extricating it from the rubbish of antiquity, and then appending the word *possession* to the incident, is a thing with neither life nor meaning.

In Lev. xiv. 34 there is a notice, well worth pondering, of the land being given for a possession. It is very casual, and ill comports with the new theory. Then in chap. xxv. we have numerous provisions for individual possessions in connection with the jubilee, and with Zelophehad's family in chap. xxvii. Again, the two and a half tribes first get their *possession.* (Numb. xxxii. 5.) So all Israel, but still in prospect, Deut. xxxii. 49. Coming down to Ezekiel, we find him very free with the expression, in regard to his city, land, prince, and otherwise. But his language is derived, not original; not the primary light, but only a *reflection* from it. For the whole state of the country—in which the priests had no land—is a demonstration of the fact that Ezekiel is going as far back as Moses (Numb. xviii. 20; Deut. xviii. 2), in saying, "Ye shall give them no possession in Israel, I am their inheritance." (xliv. 28.) And this is only an instance of Ezekiel's position throughout. The notices in Joshua are of the same secondary character. (xxi. 12, 39; xxii. 4, 9, 19.) The same appears in 1 Chron. vii. 28; ix. 2. The reference in 2 Chron. xi. 14 is from the clearly past to an older past—precisely what Moses had given to the Levites of landed possession, being now allowed by the chronicler. Again, chap. xxxi. 1 is the clearest echo of all that the Pentateuch had said of individual *possessions.* We infer that to ascribe this expression to a sixth century inventor is not *criticism*, but a burlesque of it.

We cannot but take notice here of the means used to give passages to P. Thus Genesis xlvii. 1–6 belongs to J; but 7–11 to P, so that he becomes writer of '*possession.*' So, taking xlviii. 1–4, Jacob we find sits up in his bed to receive Joseph, and recites the vision when the land was promised him

for a 'possession.' It looks like one piece. But no; the first two verses are from E, and the next two (with 'possession') from P. So in chapter xlix. 1–28 (J), Jacob has been blessing his sons. But, just in the middle of verse 28, J is put aside to let P say, "He blessed them, and charged them to bury him" in the Mamre *possession*. And who would have supposed that verses 12, 13 of chapter l. were not by the same author as 1–11? And yet they are not. For J, having no right to the word 'possession,' must give place for the moment to him who has.

Once more, Deuteronomy xxxii. 1–47 is said to be by D. But verse 49 has 'possession,' and therefore must go to P.

(No. 23.) "The cognate verb to 'possession'—rather a peculiar word"—occurs in Genesis xxxiv. 10, xlvii. 27; Numbers xxxii. 30; Joshua xxii. 9, 19.

Now in regard to the first of these—the unhappy business about Shechem—we are asked to believe that it floated down the stream of time till it was picked up by the collector about 800, and was again laid hold of by P, who clothed it with the word 'possess.' Then we are to believe that verses 7, 11 belong to J, while 8–10 are given up to P. This is hard to accept. And still harder, to read chapter xlvii. 27, "Israel dwelt in . . . Goshen" (J); "and they had possessions therein" (P). As to the three other cases the peculiarity is, "*possessed possessions.*" The connection, however, with Moses and Joshua is still of the closest. And especially in the last case, when Joshua appeals in his honest mistake to the Reubenites. Was P then the first to record this?

(No. 24.) Miknē—"purchase, purchased possession." The word is of great antiquity, as being directly from that word 'get' of Eve in Genesis iv. 1. Now the only reason for quoting it here would be, if it had this *distinctive sense* in all the alleged passages from 'P.' (Gen. xvii. 12, &c.; xxiii. 18; Exodus xii. 44; Lev. xxv. 16, &c.; xxvii. 22; and Jer. xxxii.) But

it is not so. For in Leviticus xxv. 16, 51, the meaning is simply *price*, *purchase money*, and Jeremiah speaks of the *evidence of the purchase*, *i.e.* the legal receipt.

Nor is this all. For the same word, with only the difference in the point (ē for a) is used for *cattle* from Genesis to Chronicles. And vowel points were not then known. Nor let us forget that this last form is used for the *purchase* in Genesis xlix. 32.

No. 25.) "Peoples (ammim), in the sense of kinsfolk (peculiar)." Thus (*a*), "That soul shall be cut off from his people." (Gen. xvii. 14; Exodus xxx. 33, &c.; xxxi. 14; Lev. vii. 20, &c.; xvii. 9; xix. 8; xxiii. 29; Numb. ix. 13.) In some cases the word is sing. (Exodus xxxi.; Lev. xvii. 4, 10; xviii. 29; xx. 3, &c.; xxiii. 30; Numbers xv. 30.)

Now if the expression be peculiar, so were the circumstances. Israel—a great band of regular kinsfolk—had become a people at last. The two were identical. And they were Jehovah's people, to whom it could be said, "Happy art thou, O Israel, who is like unto thee?" It was a serious thing, then, to be cut off from such a people, and might well arouse a solemn question about the future. It was now only that the language had got such a meaning. And since it sprang out of the new legislation, who should employ it but the recorder of that?

Let us note here a peculiarity which 'criticism' is hardly entitled to overlook. It is this, that when the singular is used (which is nearly as often as the plural), the expression is not '*from*,' but '*from the midst of*.' Who will explain for us these niceties?

(*b.*) "Gathered to his people." A new expression. For only now was there a people to be gathered to. And it meant something more than mere dying. But "it is peculiar to P." Yes, when he uses it. But that is only when suitable. From Adam to Terah there had been no such 'people,' and so these

patriarchs had only *died*. From Abraham to Moses they are 'gathered to their fathers.' And yet even P is not so wedded to the phrase that he can use no other. For of both Aaron and Moses he says not only this, but that they 'died.'

(*c.*) "Among thy [his] people"—four times; *e.g.* "Go not about as a tale-bearer among thy people." And legislation could hardly overlook such a practice.

(No. 26.) Sojourner, settler (stranger). Now, as Abraham must have used some title for himself at Hebron, what so fit as this? (Gen. xxiii. 4.) And it was needful afterwards to legislate for such; hence the whole list—Exodus xii. 45; Lev. xxii. 10; xxv. 6, 35, 40, 45, 47; Numb. xxxv. 15. In one case only is it otherwise used, and that speaks strongly for the antiquity of the passage. The land is Jehovah's, and not to be sold; for "ye are strangers and sojourners with me." (Lev. xxv. 23.)

(No. 27.) Getting, acquisition (*kinyān*), a very simple old Hebrew term, very fit for ancient acquisitions. Thus Eve, as mentioned above, says, "I have *gotten* a man," and calls him "*Cain*." Cf. our word *gain*. See Genesis xxxi. 18; xxxiv. 23; xxxvi. 6; Lev. xxii. 11; Josh. xiv. 4. And, as a poetical word, Ps. civ. 4; cv. 21; Prov. iv. 7; Ezekiel xxxviii. 12, &c.

(No. 28.) *Rigour*, used twice of Pharaoh's treatment of the Hebrews. Then the people are exhorted against the same towards the poor and stranger (Lev. xxv. 43, &c.), from which Ezekiel naturally took up the word in denouncing the false shepherds for their cruelty. (xxxiv. 4.)

(No. 29.) "Judgments (*shephatim*); not the usual word." It occurs in the Pentateuch four times, in Ezekiel ten, and twice besides. That it is not the usual word for 'judgment,' as ordinance or decision, is true; but it is *the* word for *judgment*,

in the sense of *chastisement, punishment.* It is thus used three times of the judgment (plagues) to come on Pharaoh, and once in reviewing the same. (Exod. vi. 6; vii. 4; xii. 12; Numb. xxxiii. 4.) Now the 'critical' view is that this word belongs, not to the Mosaic age but to Ezekiel's, and hence is a peculiarity of P. The case is this. Nothing can look more like the *original* than the use in Exodus—"I will redeem you with great judgments"; "I will bring forth mine armies by great judgments"; "Against all the gods of Egypt will I execute judgments." Nothing more lifelike can be imagined. It is Ezekiel that is the copy, not this. And as Moses professes to give it right from God, the clear presumption is that it is so.

But there is more than presumption; for look at the fourth case. It is Numb. xxxiii. 3, 4, being a fresh account of the leaving of Egypt on the morrow after the Passover, and that "with a high hand in the sight of all the Egyptians." The reason of this is then told; for the Egyptians "*were burying* (R.V.) all the firstborn, &c.; *upon their gods also* Jehovah executed judgments"; that is to say on the *sacred animals*, which symbolically were gods to the people. And in this huge burial work all were so engrossed that Israel had nothing to do but to march out in triumph. Now, who inserted this here as a record of a minute fact forty years before? Who but he who had mixed in it all, and is now (so it is said) ordered to write it? To ascribe to P such an accurate interweaving of these remarkable minutiæ is not tolerable. The words in Exodus are the living original, and this notice in Numbers is the vivid reflection of that. Hence we say it is a moral certainty that the words are by Moses.

How Ezekiel has come to use the same expression is very plain. He has been poring over the old record, and has become imbued with its language; and now it is Israel that has become heir of Pharaoh's obstinacy, and therefore 'judgment.' And as Tyre, Moab, and Egypt have chosen the same course they must know the same chastisement.

(No. 30.) Fathers' houses = families. Exodus; Numbers; Joshua. When, then, should the expression be used, but *first*, at the origin of the *nation?* Then in the numbering? And lastly, in the allotting of the land? And if the one writer of such matters be P, then the word is his.

(No. 31.) "Hosts of the Israelites" (*Tsebaoth*), Exodus and Numbers; "Deut. xx. 9 differently." Now what is the fact? Five times the notice is of the hosts as *moving*, and fourteen times as *being numbered.* Deuteronomy has no occasion to mention either of these, but gives an order to appoint "captains of the hosts," in case of war. Is that the 'differently'?

(No. 32.) "Congregation (*adah*) of the Israelites"—frequent in Pent. and rare besides. That is to say, it bears every mark of the Mosaic age, and none of a later.

(No. 33.) "Between the two evenings"—ten times in Pent., not even in Ezek. But how a characteristic of P.? It occurs only in orders for sacrifice, and that subject is his in the mass.

(No. 34.) "In all your dwellings." An expression most fit to commence its course in Egypt and the wilderness (Exodus xii. 20; xxxv. 3)—being next projected into futurity by adding "*throughout your generations.*" (Lev. xxiii. 14, etc.) In Numbers xv. 2 the expression, "When ye be come to the land of your dwellings," would, in ordinary cases, be taken as indicative of Mosaic authorship. As to the word, it is twice used by Ezek., but in a manner that seems to indicate a different age rather than the same. (See chap. vi. 6, 14.) "In all your dwelling-places the cities shall be laid waste." Now, according to the Mosaic usage, the *dwellings* would be *in the cities*, not the converse.

(No. 35.) "This is the thing that the Lord hath commanded." Yes, and on distinct, specified occasions; as the gathering of the manna, the bringing of the sanctuary offerings, the consecration of Aaron, the slaughtering of beasts inside or outside the camp, making a vow or oath, and the affair of Zelophehad's daughters. All these being matters for immediate action, and in which we seem to hear the very voice and feel the very breath of Moses in conveying the order. Thus we can realize the matter; but not as a report caught up and coloured by any one in the sixth century.

(No. 36.) "A head (*skull*) in enumerations." Now the word is thus used in Pent. nine times, meaning, 'By their polls.' And here we note two things. (1) That whereas it is said to be one of P's characteristics that, in relating a series of similar matters, he uses the same terms throughout, here it is not so; for to only two out of thirteen tribes does he apply the word. (Numb. i.) (2) After the Pent. it is used once in a numbering by David (1 Chron. xxiii. 3, 24), and never again. See the lists in 1 Chron. vii. ix.; Ezra ii. viii.; Neh. vii. xi. It seems, then, that the word is quite old—Mosaic in fact; and soon fell into disuse. How then did P get it?

(No. 37.) "Remain over (*adaph*) not the usual word." That, we may say, would be *nothar*. Now (1) it would seem from this as if the first of these was *the word* of P, the second being given up to others. And yet this second is used by P quite freely. (2) The words are synonyms, but with a clear difference; the one being an *overplus* after a calculation, the other an ordinary *remainder*. Thus, the cloth being cut for the curtains, there will be half a cubit over (*adaph*). (Exodus xxvi. 12.) But when anything *remains* from a sacrifice, that is the other word. (xxix. 34.) This comes out in Lev. xxv. 27 and xxvii. 18, both cases treating of redemption money for land. But the one is of a *balance* (*adaph*) to be returned, the

other of a *remainder* of years. In case of the manna (Exodus xvi. 18, 20) both the words are thus used.

(No. 38.) "Ruler or prince (*nasi*) among the Israelites," as in Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Joshua. But why ignore the previous use in Gen. xvii. 20; xxiii. 6; xxv. 16; xxxiv. 2; as well as "once by J E"? This surely lessens the value of the assertion. Until Ezekiel it almost disappears; when "he employs it often, even of the king"; which use, from all the circumstances, we are entitled to regard as a *reflection*, not as *original*.

(No. 39.) "Rulers, princes," with "congregation." After what has just been said there is not much to add. When once the congregation gets 'rulers' they must have a name, and what so natural as the plural of the old one? Now the first incidents about them show us much. The first of these is their action about the manna (Exodus xvi. 22), then at the shining of Moses' face (xxxiv. 31). After that we have them engaged in the census (Numb. iv. 32), with those involved in Korah's rebellion (xvi. 2); with which we may take the important facts in xxvii. 2; xxxi. 13; xxxii. 2; xxxvi. 1—all pointing to persons as old as Moses, with presumably titles as old. The other cases are from Joshua with similar facts.

(No 40.) "Deep rest" (*shabbathon*). It is simply an intense expression for the Sabbath, found eleven times, and mostly joined with it. One notable thing is the variation in the connection of the word with the allied ones, showing a style of mind not to be looked for in a sixth century scribe. Another thing is the absence of the word in the post-Pentateuchal writings, although the *Sabbath* is mentioned about 110 times in the Old Testament.

(No. 41.) "According to the command (*mouth*) of Jehovah"—Exodus xvii. 1; Lev. xxiv. 12; also Numbers and

Joshua—"very uncommon elsewhere," and never in Ezekiel. All the cases represent *facts*—as the numbering and journeying of the people, and providing for them in Canaan. The word looks extremely like a direction at the time by Moses and Joshua, probably by Urim and Thummim. But it is unaccountable that, away from the impulse of circumstances, anyone, 800 years after, should in this most natural way have thrust in the expression as his own peculiarity *just in these places*, and *no more*.

(No. 42.) "Half (*matsith*, eleven times) not the usual word." Now this, the *less usual* word, is only a lengthened form of *hetsi*, *the usual*. And though it is true that the shorter form—*with the addition* of particles, such as 'and'—is more frequent throughout the Old Testament as a whole; still the shorter form by itself occurs—Exodus—Numbers—only seven times, against eleven of the longer. Such is the value of the 'critical' plea. The two forms, in fact, seem interchangeable.

(No. 43.) "*Maal*, to trespass, with the cognate noun, eight times in Pentateuch." It is simply, as the critic says, a "word belonging to the priestly terminology." And thus we account for it as *the word of the subject*. Ezekiel uses it seven times, and we explain that in the same way.

(No. 44.) "The methodical form of subscription and superscription" in lists, genealogical, &c., as Genesis x., xxv., xxxvi., xlvi.; Exodus i., vi.; Numbers i., iv., vii., xxxiii.; Joshua xiii.–xvi., xviii., xix.

Now little objection need be taken to the statement of fact as regards Genesis. But in the first verse of Exodus we find a superscription with no counterpart. And what would our critic say about the list in Numbers xxxiii.? Coming next to Joshua there seems to be frequently a similar feature. It

seems, in fact, that this custom of *repetitions* belongs to the most primitive form of registrations, which would naturally be engrossed by the collector as he found them. The style however began after a time to vary, as appears in Joshua, till in the later books it is entirely gone, and only a short title appears. Thus it is with the long lists in 1 Chronicles, commencing with nine chapters of genealogies. Those in chapter 9 come down till after the captivity in connection with "priests and Levites." And yet there is no trace of P's famous practice here. Hence while it is inconceivable that these old registers waited for him to collect them, it is equally hard to imagine him as the self-asserting man, who having got hold of them could not let them go till he had branded them with a special mark of his own. It was something truly for a priest of that day to transport himself back to the hoariest antiquity, and invent for it so fitting a language, without even a model before him!

Returning to 1 Chronicles we find a list of David's worthies in xi. 26–47, and kindred matter in chapter xii. The only approach to the old style here—and probably a faint echo of it—lies in the counterpart notices of the Danites (*vv.* 8, 14; see also chapters xv. xxiii.–xxvii.)

So Ezra ii. has only a short title to a long list of those who returned with Zerubbabel. (Cf. viii. 1–14.) See how informal, in x. 2, 44, is the introduction and the conclusion to the list of those who had put away their strange wives. Then in Nehemiah, chapter iii., the list has neither title nor postscript. In chapter vii. the long list has a title, but nothing more. So chapters x.–xii. And all this shows the atmosphere which P must have breathed.

(45.) This number contains several particulars.

(*a*) "*Tribe.* For this P has nearly always *mattah*, rarely *shebhet*." But there is a clear distinction betwixt the two. *Mattah* is the word for the tribe *when named*, as in the lists in

Numbers i., ii., xiii., xxxvi.; Joshua xviii.–xxi; 1 Chron. vi. *Shebhet* is used for tribes in general. So Joshua xxiv. 1; Judges xviii. 1, and constantly in the historical books for "the tribes of Israel." See also Exodus xxviii. 21; xxxix. 14; Joshua xiii. 7; xviii. 2, 4; Numbers xxxiii. 54; cf. iv. 18. So Ezekiel has only the term which is *not* 'P's,' and the Psalms also. The distinction is brought out in Numbers xviii. 2—"the tribe of Levi (mattah), the tribe of thy father" (shebhet). And the case in Joshua vii. 14 (*bis*), *shebhet*, but *mattah* with *Judah.* (*v.* 18.)

(*b*) To beget. There are two forms of this (as if we should write begot and begat). The one is *holid* (P), the other *yalad* (J). Now the first is used down to Numbers xxvi. 29, 58, while the other stops at Genesis xxv. 3. Why then not take this as from a register which came down no farther?

(*c*) The hardening of Pharaoh's heart, of which two words are used, the second being 'to make heavy.' So the regular 'harden' is given to P. But why not just two synonyms and one author? For the first 'harden' is used, with one exception, of Jehovah's direct act; while the second is used of Pharaoh's action or of the simple *result.* In one case the two are combined in a way that we do not elsewhere think of splitting up. It is in Exodus vii. 13, 14 where it is said, "He hardened Pharaoh's heart"; and then, "Pharaoh's heart is hardened."

(*d*) "To stone—two words, *ragam* (P) and *sakal.* Now see the difference in *idea. Ragam,* as by its etymology, signifies to *overwhelm with stones,* which was done by the community, turning out against the offender. *Sagal* is of stoning, independently of this idea. Thus it is the word for pelting with stones in 2 Samuel xvi. 7, 13; and the distinction between the words comes out in Joshua vii. 14 where, after Achan has been overwhelmed with stones (*ragam*) there follows a *reference* to the fact (*sagal*). Now as to the *usage,* there are only three clear cases of P in Pentateuch (Numbers xiv. 10; xv. 35, 36). For Deut. xxi. 21 is not by P; and the five

cases from Leviticus (xx. 2, 27; xxiv. 16, 23) are from the *law of Holiness*, which *is taken away from P in favour of a certain H.* The cases of *sakal* will show the difference at once. (Exodus viii. 26; xxi. 17, 4; xix. 13; xxi. 28, 29, 32.) The others, *as from Deuteronomy*, should not be claimed for P. (Chapters xiii. 10; xvii. 5; xxii. 21, 24.)

(*e*) To spy—*tur* and *ragal*. Now 'criticism' seems ill-spent in contriving different authors for these verbs. *Tur* is *the word* for *search out*, as elsewhere used, as Numbers x. 33 (J E); Deut. i. 33 (D). (See the same word for other searchings—Numbers xv. 39; Ezek. xx. 6; Ecclesiastes i. 13; ii. 3.) Now this is the term for all the *searching of the land at the time.* The other (*ragal*), to *walk over*, is an accommodation, sufficient to bring back the real fact already recorded. Hence it is not used till *after the event*, commencing at Numbers xxi. 32; Deut. i. 24, and kept up eight times by Joshua, who knew so well what that walking meant. In regard to Deut. i. 24, it should be noticed how D uses the word *ragal* in this *retrospective* way, and in verse 33 the word *tur* for investigation. So J E, who uses *tur* (to search) (Numbers iv. 33), is entirely one with P, who uses it so freely in Numbers xiii. with such specific directions to the same effect.

(*f*) The short form for I (*ani*) is used, we are told, 130 times by P, and the longer (*anochi*) only once. (Gen. xxiii. 4.) So in Ezekiel 138 times, and the other once. (xxxvi. 28.) This sounds serious. As before, we have to look as well as listen.

Now it would seem as if this meant that *ani* is peculiar to P, and yet that is far from being the case; for it occurs in the Pentateuch, in passages *not his*, forty-six times, with six in Deuteronomy, or fifty-two in all. Now it is true, Dr. Driver only says that P has *ani* 130 times, as against *anochi* once. But in suppressing the other view he seems to intimate something besides. And why again should we allow to P all the passages in "the Code of Holiness" (Lev. xvii. 26), which the critics say *is not the work* of P? Now these passages are sixty, leaving only seventy against the fifty-two on the other side.

So much from *counting* the passages. But we have still to *weigh* them, and the question is, Can we find no satisfactory account of the two usages? To which we confidently reply that we can. For if the *ani* be clearly *emphatic*, and the *anochi* not, then the different usages will enable us to dispense with different authorships. We say nothing of the usage in Eccl. and such books, being concerned now with the Pentateuch and Ezekiel. There will always be room for different views of emphasis; but if a clear rule is made out by a full induction, that should guide in questionable cases. And that being done we shall be helped to the real sentiment with which things are spoken. As when Abraham says to the king of Sodom, "Lest thou shouldst say, *I* have made Abraham rich"; or Eliab, "*I* know thy pride." David, on the other hand, avoids emphasis in saying, "I come to thee." For *he himself* is nothing. The name of Jehovah is all. (1 Sam. xvii. 28, 45.)

Let us now turn to Deuteronomy, of which one of the characteristics is *anochi* instead of *ani*, and very distinct is the want of emphasis in it. In the great majority of cases it is used in the expression, "Statutes which I am commanding," or the equivalents of this. Then we have, 'I stood,' 'I stand,' 'I am to die,' 'I know thy rebellion,' 'I am 120 years old.' Several times we have it from the Divine mouth, and evidently without emphasis. Thus 5, 6, "I am Jehovah thy God, which brought thee, &c.; I am Jehovah, a jealous God." (Sept. and Vulg.) The emphasis is in the *matter* not the *name*. So "I will *surely hide* my face." The emphasis is on the verb. See for same usage xviii. 19, and even xxxii. 40. "I lift up my hand, and say, I live for ever."

In contrast with this we must give the cases of *ani* in the same book, whether from passages marked P or J E. Thus xxix. 6, "That ye might know that *I* am Jehovah, your God." xxxii. 21, "And *I* will move them to jealousy." Verse 39, "*I*, even *I*, am He; *I* kill, and make alive; I wound, and *I*

heal." Verse 52, "Canaan which *I* give to Israel." And very striking, where no Divine name comes in, is the use of *ani* simply for emphasis in xii. 30—"I will do so, *even I*."

Turning to Lev. xvii.–xxvi. we find it still more marked by the emphatic *ani* with Jehovah, than Deuteronomy was by the non-emphatic *anochi* with Moses. This expression swallows up all others in the portion, "*I* am Jehovah," in some form. In other passages with *ani*, to emphasize the *doings* of the same *Jehovah*, as "*I* cast out"; "*I* give you"; "*I* bring you"; "*I* will set my face against"; "*I* have given it on the altar to atone," &c. And see xxvi. 24, 28, "*I* also, &c., I, even *I*, will chastise."

Ezekiel.—The *ani* is so clearly emphatic here that to cite passages would be superfluous, for it seems to be the one burden of the prophecy to imbue the captives with the conviction—*I am Jehovah.* This was the grand lesson that the idolatrous people supremely needed, and was equally fitted to rebuke and encourage. Take away this, indeed, and there is nothing left for any list of the cases.

It is safe now to say that, among the 138 cases, there is only one where this could be fairly doubted. It is where he says at viii. 1, "As I (*ani*) was sitting in my house," which, in an ordinary way, would certainly be without emphasis. But Ezekiel's case was the opposite of ordinary from the first. And it is more likely than not that there was something notable even in this, considering what came out of it. Year, day, month, company, are all specified; and after the full evidence in the book as to *ani* we are little entitled to deny that there is emphasis here. And twice besides, let us observe, has the prophet had occasion to emphasize his own personality. As ix. 8, "They were slaying, and *I* was left"; xii. 9, "When thy people say, What doest thou? . . . say *I* am your sign."

Thus, in Leviticus, the corner-stone of the legislation is—

I am Jehovah. And now amid the universal collapse of the nation the remedy is still the same—*I am Jehovah.*

The use of *ani* in Genesis we cannot pass by. The cases are forty, of which about two-thirds belong to J and E. But the evidence is the same that *ani* is emphatic.

Genesis ix. 12 (the Covenant which *I* make); xiv. 23 (*I* have made rich); xv. 7 (*I* am Jeh.); xvii. 1, 4 (*I* am El Sh.; *I*, my covenant is); xviii. 17 (Shall *I* hide); xxiv. 45 (*I*, before I had, &c.); xxvii. 8 (What *I* (not another) command); verse 24 (*I*), 32 (*I* am thy son); xxviii. 13 (*I* am Jeh.); xxxi. 44 (*I* and thou); xxxiv. 30 (*I* being few); xxxv. 11 (*I* am El Sh.); xxxvii. 10, 30 (*I* and thy mother; *I* whither, &c.); xl. 16 (*I* also was); xli. 9 (*I* remember), 2 (*I* and he), 44 (*I* am Ph.); xlii. 18 (*I* fear Elohim); xlv. 3, 4 (*I* am Joseph); xlix. 29 (*I* am to, &c.); xxvii. 34, 38 (even *I bis*); xxxi. 52 (that *I* will not); l. 19 (*I* am in the place of); vi. 17 (*I*, behold I); ix.9 (*I*, behold I); xxii. 5 (*I* and the lad); xxxiii. 14 (*I* will lead on softly); xli. 15 (Ph. said, *I* have dreamed); xlii. 37 (*I* will bring him); xliii. 14 (*I*, if I am bereaved); xlviii. 7 (*I* = as for me), 22 (and *I* gave thee).

Let us now see in contrast with this the use of *anochi* * in the same book. Genesis iii. 10 (I was naked); iv. 9 (My brother's *keeper* am I?); xv. 14 (I will judge); xxiv. 24 (I am daughter of), 34 (I am servant); xxv. 22 (Why am I so?), 30 (I am faint); xxix. 33 (I was hated); xxx. 1 (or I die), 2 (Am I instead?); vii. 4 (I am about to rain); xv. 1 (I am a shield to thee); xvi. 5 (I gave my maid), 8 (I flee from); xx. 6 (Yea, I know); xxi. 14 (I will swear), 26 (I heard not); xxiii. 4 (I am a stranger); xxiv. iii. (I dwell), 13 (I stand), 27 (I was in the way), 37 (I dwell), 42 (I go; I stand); xxv. 32 (I am about to die); xxvi. 24 (I am the God of); xxvii. 19 (I am Esau); xxviii. 15 (I am with thee), 20 (I go); xxx. 3 (I shall have children; when shall I provide?); xxxi. 5

* This in the Hebrew is the prominent word.

(I see), 13 (I am the God of), 38 (I have been with thee), 39 (I bare the loss); xxxii. 12 (I fear him); xxxvii. 16 (I seek); xxxviii. 17 (I will send), 25 (I am with child); xliii. 9 (I will be surety); xlvi. 3 (I am the God of), 4 (I will go down); xlvii. 30 (I will do it); xlviii. 21 (I die); so l. 5, 21 (I will nourish); xv. 2 (I go childless); xviii. 27 (I am dust, &c.); xix. 19 (I cannot escape); xxiv. 31 (I have prepared); xxvii. 11 (I am a smooth man); xxviii. 15, 16 ("I am with thee; I knew it not").

Such are the cases of *anochi* in Genesis; and any, less like emphatic, could hardly be. If it seems that a few *might be such* that is all that can be said, and even in these there is enough in the context to show that they are not.

Thus, by getting a clear reason for the use of the two forms we do away with the assumption that one of them is simply a peculiarity of P. And more than that, we get a substantial argument for the presence of a presiding mind with a vital principle.

There may however be some difficulty in accepting this view of the two forms, for it is certain that the unemphatic *anochi* would better have suited the "measured and prosaic P"; and the 130 cases of *ani* the 'lively' J. Thus it seems that each of the compilers has made a radical mistake!

(No. 46.) Kirjath-Arba for Hebron as peculiar to P five times—Genesis xxiii. 2; xxxv. 27; Joshua xiv. 15; xx. 7; Judges i. 10. This argument we can little appreciate. But the tendency to keep up the name K. A. is shown by the fact that so late as Nehemiah (xi. 25) it appears alone. As to the mention of simple Hebron in Numbers xiii. 22, *said to be by* J E, the reference is so casual that no more could have been looked for. And why verse 22 is assigned to J E when verse 21 belongs to another we cannot tell.

(No. 47.) Machpelah. For the authorship of the passages, we refer to what was said on No. 22 above.

(No. 48.) Padan-Aram (P), Gen. xxv. 20; xxviii. 2, 5, 6, 7; xxxi. 18; xxxiii. 18; xxxv. 6, 9, 16; xlvi. 15. But J has Aram-Naharaim. (Gen. xxiv. 10; as in Deut. xxiii. 4; Judges iii. 8.)

Now this we take as a matter of simple geography. Padan-Aram was the *plain of Aram*, as contrasted with Aram, west of Euphrates, with its desert and mountains. Thus it would naturally be spoken of from the west as Padan-Aram. And this is what we find. Even in xxxi. 18 it is the *writer's point* of view that fixes the name. Jacob even says, "When I came from *Padan*," so well was the country known as *the plain*. Cf. Hosea xii. 12, "Jacob fled into the field of Aram." Now see the use of *Aram Naharaim*, Syria between the rivers. The view is now internal, as formerly external. Thus Genesis xxiv. 10, Eliezer is *in* the country; Deut. xxiii. 4, Balaam belongs to it; Judges iii. 8, Cushan-Rishathaim is its king.

(No. 49.) Desert of Zin. (Num. xiii. 21; xx. 1a; xxvii. 14; xxxiii. 36; xxxiv. 3; Deut. xxxii. 51; Joshua xv. 1.) And Zin. (Num. xxxiv. 4; Josh. xv. 3.) Now observe that in the first case the verse is given to P only by being wrenched from the previous one. Still less can we accept of the half of verse 1 in chap. 20 as P's. As for xxxiii. 36 we have seen the reasons under No. 29 above for ascribing it to Moses. So xxvii. 14 and Deut. xxxiv. 51 forbid any other reference. And Numbers xxxiv. 3 and Joshua xv. 1, 3, are too strongly marked by circumstance to come from a sixth century scribe.

(No. 50.) The plains of Moab. (Num. xxii. 1; xxvi. 3, 63; xxxi. 12; xxxiii. 48–50; xxxv. 1; xxxvi. 13; Deut. xxxiv. 1, 8; Joshua xiii. 32.) Now as to the first of these, it is hard for *non-critics* to take it as P. For chapter xxi. ends with J E, and the whole of chapter xxii. (except *v.* 1) "may be assigned, with some confidence, to E." This is the first difficulty. And, as to the second case, it is most likely that

if Moses and Eleazar numbered the people there, they drew up some record of it, instead of leaving it to be found out by P. But if they neither numbered nor recorded, it is not worth while to seek for the inventor of the Moab plains. But, in fact, there is such a naturalness about each mention of the place, that it seems extremely unnatural to ascribe it to some inexplicable partiality of the supposed writer, who has been invoked on the occasion.

After this list comes a reference to what is said of Eleazar. For, "though not unmentioned in the other sources, he is specially prominent in P." Now two other mentions are enough seriously to affect the value of P's "specialty." And then see the direct evidence of this "specialty." Num. xxxii. 2 is one of the passages which prove it. And yet verses 1–17 "belong in the main to J E," the only exception being the second half of verse 2, *which names Eleazar.* That is to say, "The people came to Moses" (J E) "and to Eleazar" (P). And such is the style and custom of the new criticism!

We may quote, in conclusion, the words in which Dr. Driver closes his argument from this list of P's peculiarities: "Under these circumstances, the statement in the *Speaker's Commentary* (i. p. 28), that the peculiarities of the Elohistic phraseology 'are greatly magnified, if they exist at all,' is a surprising one." Now the only thing that surprises us here is the moderation of the statement.

Having thus examined in detail those 'Peculiarities of P,' which are thought enough to shatter the unity of the Pentateuch, we leave it to candid scholarship to say whether the evidence from this very source points more to the authorship of a well-known Moses, or that of an imaginary priest in Ezekiel's time?

W. Brendon and Son, Printers, Plymouth.

THE KING'S INSTITUTE
THE CHURCH ON THE WAY

DATE DUE

THE KING'S LIBRARY
3000023293